LOMONOSOV MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF COMPUTATIONAL MATHEMATICS AND CYBERNETICS

Manuscript copyright

arXiv:1611.04843v3 [cs.CC] 20 Nov 2016

Volkov
Sergey

FINITE BASES WITH RESPECT TO THE SUPEROSITION IN CLASSES of ELEMENTARY RECURSIVE FUNCTIONS

Specialty 01.01.09 — Discrete Mathematics and Mathematical Cybernetics

Dissertation
seeking the degree
of the Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences

Supervisor:
Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences,
Professor S. S. Marchenkov

Moscow — 2009

Contents

Introduction **3**

1. An Overview of the Results in the Thesis 3
   - 1.1. Classification of Recursive Functions 3
   - 1.2. Finite Superposition Bases 7
2. General Description of the Paper 10
3. Summary of the Main Results 15
   - 3.1. Basic definitions 15
   - 3.2. Main results of Chapter 1 17
   - 3.3. Main results of Chapter 2 23
   - 3.4. Main results of Chapter 3 24

1. Generating Classes by Superposition of Simple Arithmetic Functions **26**

1. Exponential Expansion of the Class of Skolem Elementary Functions and a Formula of Height two 26
   - 1.1. Definitions 26
   - 1.2. Inclusion $[T]_{x^y} \subseteq \mathrm{XS}$ 28
   - 1.3. The Classes $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$, $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}_{f}$, and T- polynomiality 35
   - 1.4. The Inclusion $\mathrm{XS} \subseteq [T]_{2^x}$ 38
   - 1.5. Proof of Theorem 1 58
2. Basis by Superposition of FFOM 59
   - 2.1. Definitions 59
   - 2.2. Coincidence of classes FFOM, $\mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{alt}}$ and $\mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{var}}$ 61
   - 2.3. Overview of Some Functions That Belong to the Class $[T']$ 63

2.4. The Correctness of Predicates that Correspond to FOM-formulas 65
2.5. Proof of Theorem 2 72
3. Hierarchies of Classes that are Exhaustive with Regard to Kalmar Elementary Functions and Formulas of an Arbitrary Height 75
3.1. Definitions 75
3.2. Coincidence of Classes XS^n and XS^n_+ 75
3.3. Proof of Theorem 3 76

2. Simple Basis by Superposition in the Class $\mathcal{E}^2$ of Grzegorczyk Hierarchy 80
1. Minsky Machines 80
2. Vector-functions, Configurations, and Their Codes 82
3. Basic Property of the Function Q 86
4. Proof of Theorem 4 90

3. Finite Generability of Some Groups of Recursive Permutations 94
1. Definitions 94
2. Finite Generability of a Group $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ 97
3. Generatability of a Group $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ by Using Two Permutations 109
4. Finite Generability of a Group $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ for Specific Classes Q . 117

Literature 121

Introduction

1. An Overview of the Results in the Thesis

1.1. Classification of Recursive Functions

The concept of algorithmic computability (the recursive one) of a computable function is prominent in modern Mathematics. The formalization of the concept of the computable function was accomplished in mid-1930 by the following famous mathematicians: A. Turing [30], E. Post [25], A. Church [17], S. Kleene [22], and others. For every such formalization there exists the thesis (Church-Turing thesis) that claims that the whole class of algorithmically computable functions coincides with the class of functions that are computable in this type of formalization.

There is a number of approaches to formalizing the concept of a computable function. However, the simpler formalizations are most favorable. The most renowned approach is the one that uses various mechanical devices such as the Turing machine [30, 25].

Another approach is based on generating functions from the set of base functions and a number of generating operations. S. Kleene in his work [22] introduced the concept of a partial recursive function. The partial recursive function is a partially defined function $f : \mathbb{N}_0^n \to \mathbb{N}_0$, which can be derived from initial functions 0, $x + 1$ with the help of a finite number of operations using the superposition (superposition includes substitution of functions into functions, permutations and identification of variables, introduction of dummy variables), primitive recursion, and minimization.

One should note that the class of all computable functions is not an adequate formalization of the computability concept in practice. For example,

the function $f(n, x)$ that us defined in the following way

$$\begin{cases} f(0, x) = x + 2, \\ f(n + 1, 0) = 1, \\ f(n + 1, x + 1) = f(n, f(n + 1, x)), \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

is computable but it grows so fast that even $f(10, 10)$ is impossible to compute in practice. Besides, there is no method for an arbitrary computable function and a set of incoming variables to predict how much time it is going to take to compute the values of the given function on a given set (and give a top down estimate of resources needed for calculations.) Furthermore, not all listed computable functions are defined everywhere (computable function is not defined on such tuples where the computing algorithm does not give an answer within a defined period of time).

In the light if these circumstances one considers narrower classes that consist only of everywhere defined recursive functions as they are closer to practical computability. The two above mentioned methods work towards this direction: the machine one (consideration of functions that are computable using different computational devices with restrictions on resources that can be in use) and the functional one (generation of classes based on some initial functions and generating operations) as well as other approaches, with which one can often encounter situations in which different approaches give the same classes in the end.

The research of these kinds of classes and a search for equivalent definitions for them can help to understand the nature of effective computability and on top of that, possibly, this kind of definitions will give an opportunity for specific functions, the computation of which has an practical application, to figure out how they can be computed effectively.

An example of this kind of class is the class of primitive recursive functions (see [3].) They say that the function $f(\tilde{x}, y)$ is obtained from functions $g(\tilde{x})$ and $h(\tilde{x}, y, z)$ with the help of the operation called *primitive recursion* if the following conditions hold:

$$\begin{cases} f(\tilde{x}, 0) = g(\tilde{x}), \\ f(\tilde{x}, y + 1) = h(\tilde{x}, y, f(\tilde{x}, y)). \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

The function is called *primitive recursive* if it can be obtained from the functions 0, $x + 1$ with the help of the superposition operation and primitive

recursion. The class of primitively recursive functions contains almost all everywhere defined functions (at $\mathbb{N}_0$) that are used in mathematical practice. This class can be described in terms of complexity of machine calculations: everywhere defined function $g(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ is primitively recursive if and only if it is computable on Turing machine with a time constrain of the kind $f(n, x_1 + \ldots + x_k)$ for some n where f is defined by the following relations (1) (see [26, 12].)

Another example is the class of functions K called Kalmar elementary [21]. The class K is a set of all functions that can be obtained from functions

$$x + 1, \quad x \div y \tag{3}$$

with the help of superposition, summation of the following kind: $\sum_{x \leqslant y}$ and restricted multiplication $\prod_{x \leqslant y}$ (here and in the following it is $x \div y = \max(0, x - y)$.) All functions from the class K are primitive recursive; however, the opposite is not true (see [21].) In terms of the machine calculations, the class K is the class of all functions $g(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, Turing machine computable with a time input constrain of the type $h_k(x_1 + \ldots + x_n)$ with some k, where

$$h_0(x) = x, \quad h_{k+1}(x) = 2^{h_k(x)},$$

an analogous statement is true for restrictions on the space (see [26].) There are other equivalent definitions for the class K. For example $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in$ K if and only if there exists such $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and polynomials $P(\tilde{x}, y, \tilde{z})$, $Q(\tilde{x}, y, \tilde{z})$ with coefficients from $\mathbb{N}_0$ that $f(\tilde{x}) \leqslant m(\tilde{x})$ and

$$(y = f(\tilde{x})) \equiv (\exists z_1)_{z_1 \leqslant m(\tilde{x})} \ldots (\exists z_l)_{z_l \leqslant m(\tilde{x})} (P(\tilde{x}, y, \tilde{z}) = Q(\tilde{x}, y, \tilde{z})),$$

where $m(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = h_k(x_1 + \ldots + x_n)$ (see [1].)

In his paper [19], A. Grzegorczyk defined hierarchy of classes $\mathcal{E}^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. They say that $f(\tilde{x}, y)$ is obtained from functions $g(\tilde{x})$, $h(\tilde{x}, y, z)$, and $j(\tilde{x}, y)$ with the help of *restricted recursion* if it satisfies the relations (2) and

$$f(\tilde{x}, y) \leqslant j(\tilde{x}, y).$$

$\mathcal{E}^n$ is a minimal class of functions that contains functions $x + 1$, $f_n(x, y)$ and is closed with respect to superposition, and restricted recursion where

$$f_0(x, y) = y + 1,$$

$$f_1(x,y) = x + y,$$
$$f_2(x,y) = (x+1)\cdot(y+1),$$

with $n \geqslant 2$

$$f_{n+1}(0,y) = f_n(y+1, y+1),$$
$$f_{n+1}(x+1,y) = f_{n+1}(x, f_{n+1}(x,y)).$$

Grzegorczyk's hierarchy is strictly monotonous and exhausts the whole class of primitive recursive functions. Besides, $\mathcal{E}^3 = \mathrm{K}$ (this is proved in [19].) For classes $\mathcal{E}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$, there exists a description as defined in terms of complexity of calculations on the Turing machines. For example $\mathcal{E}^2$ is a set of all functions that can be computed on the Turing machine with a linear space (of its input length; the numbers are represented in the binary form), see [26].

One more class that deserves attention is the class introduced by T. Skolem in [28, 29], the class of elementary functions ("lower elementary functions"). This class will be defined as S and will be called the class of functions that are Skolem elementary. S is a minimal class that contains functions (3) and is closed with respect to superposition and restricted summation of the kind $\sum_{x \leqslant y}$. For the class that is lacking any sort of description based on the complexity of machine calculations. It is known that $\mathrm{S} \subseteq \mathcal{E}^2$, but the question of coincidence of these classes is an open one at this time (see [10].) Besides, it is known that S contains NP-hard functions (see the proof for another class in [31], connection with the class S in [10]).

These classes differ in terms of the speed of growth of the contained functions. For example all functions of the classes $\mathcal{E}^2$ and S constrained by polynomials and $\mathcal{E}^3$ contain functions that grow exponentially. To distinguish the computational complexity of functions in its pure form for every class Q one considers set Q_* of all predicates with characteristic functions from Q (the characteristic function of a predicate is the function that equals to 1 for all sets, at which the value of the predicate is true and equals to 0 at all other sets). It is known that [19] the hierarchy $\mathcal{E}^n_*$, $n \geqslant 2$ is strictly monotonous. Besides, it is known that [5],

$$\mathrm{S}_* \subseteq \mathcal{E}^0_*.$$

The question is, which of the classes S_*, $\mathcal{E}^0_*$, $\mathcal{E}^1_*$, $\mathcal{E}^2_*$ coincide and which ones do not, and it is an open one.

One will also note that in terms of approximating the class of practically computable functions, it is convenient to consider the class FP of functions Turing machine computable in polynomial time (of the input length). The class FP also has equivalent functional definitions (see [16, 15]). They are more involved then the ones described above; other definitions, thus, will not be described in this paper.

1.2. Finite Superposition Bases

For the first time the question of generating quite broad and substantially interesting classes of recursive functions with the help of only the superposition operation was considered by Grzegorczyk in 1953 in his paper [19]. The superposition basis in a class will be defined as a complete system with respect to superposition in this class. Traditionally, in theory of recursive functions one does not need to satisfy the requirement of minimality for such systems. In [19], it was demonstrated that the class of primitive recursive functions does not have a finite bases with respect to superposition. In this paper, one considers the existence of such bases in classes $\mathcal{E}^n$.

The interest to the problem of having finite bases with respect to superposition in classes of recursive functions is due to a few factors. Firstly, the operation of the superposition is a relatively weak one, thus, one can expect the functions from similar bases systems to a significant degree reflect the specifics of the class, its arithmetic and algorithmic nature and perhaps complexity in one of its aspects. A well defined bases can be the necessary grounds for canonical representations that give a chance to compare and evaluate different parameters of the class of functions. The definition of the class of functions rooted in its bases is one of the non-redundant (and in a sense effective) definitions of the class.

The problem, as was stated by Grzegorczyk, is solved in two steps. The existence of finite bases with respect to superposition in classes $\mathcal{E}^n$ $(n \geqslant 3)$ was proved by D. Rödding in 1964 in his paper [27]. The Redding's proof was so cumbersome that the bases were not written out in an explicit way. In his paper [24], in 1968 Ch. Parsons obtained easier bases with respect

to the superposition in classes $\mathcal{E}^n$ $(n \geqslant 3)$. Rödding and Parsons used a method to build their bases, which, in this paper, is referred to as the method of generating functions. The gist of this method is that for the function one builds generating functions that is the function, every value of which contains information about the initial values in the initial function. For example, the function $f(x)$ has its generating function of the type

$$g(x) = \prod_{i \leqslant x} p_i^{f(i)},$$

where p_i is the i-th prime number. If functions can be obtained from other functions with the help of restricted recursion, summation, etc., then their corresponding generating functions can be obtained with the help of just the superposition (though with a set of some helping functions). To use the method of generating functions one must have functions that grow at least exponentially. All functions from classes $\mathcal{E}^0$, $\mathcal{E}^1$, $\mathcal{E}^2$ are constrained by polynomials, thus for them the method of generating functions does not work.

For the class $\mathcal{E}^2$, the difficulties with building up the bases were overcome in 1969 by S.S. Marchenkov in his work [9] (see also [6]). In this paper, one used the method based on modeling a kind of Turing machine. An important role, when building a bases with the help of the "machine method" is played by the numerating functions (the functions that enumerate tuples). All functions of the classes $\mathcal{E}^0$ and $\mathcal{E}^1$ are constrained from the top by linear functions and, thus, do not contain numerating functions. The problem of superposition bases existence in $\mathcal{E}^0$ and $\mathcal{E}^1$ still remains open. Also, the question of a bases existence in S is still open too (in it, there are numerating functions but the 'machine' method does not work for it for other reasons).

In 1970 in the paper [12] A.A. Muchnik inspired by the idea of S.S. Marchenkov [9] proposed a quite simple method to build bases with the help of the superposition in some classes of recursive functions. This method is based on using special functions (called quasi-universal) grounded in numerating Turing machines. In this paper the existence of bases was proved for a big family of classes that are defined by using the complexity of Turing computations as well as based on the results of [26] one obtains an alternative proof of existence of finite bases in $\mathcal{E}^n$, $n \geqslant 2$.

Of special interest is the problem of building bases that are as simple as

possible. In this direction, there were obtained a few interesting results. The first salient advancement in this field was the result [7] accomplished by S.S. Marchenkov in the year of 1980: the superposition basis in the class K is the system

$$\{x+1, \quad \left[\frac{x}{y}\right], \quad x^y, \quad \varphi(x,y)\},$$

where $\varphi(x,y)$ for $x > 1$ equals to the least index of the zero digit in the representation of the number y in a positional number system with base x, when $x \leqslant 1$ it equals zero. In the same paper, it was shown that the superposition of functions

$$x+1, \quad x \div y, \quad \left[\frac{x}{y}\right], \quad x^y$$

is the one for which one can obtain all the functions from K that take a finite number values. In 1989, the work of [8] proved that the basis in the class K is

$$\{x \div 1, \quad \left[\frac{x}{y}\right], \quad 2^{x+y}, \quad \sigma(x)\},$$

where $\sigma(x)$ is the number of ones in the binary representation of x. Note that in all the above mentioned bases in the class K in addition to standard arithmetic functions it contains a one "bad" function that, although it has a very simple form, is not in its pure form an arithmetic one. S. Mazzanti in 2002 in the work of [23] managed to get rid of the "bad" function. In this work, he proved that

$$\{x+y, \ x \div y, \ \left[\frac{x}{y}\right], \ 2^x\}$$

is the basis for the superposition in the class K.

As an example of application of the above results, one gives the formula for the binomial coefficient:

$$\binom{x}{y} = \left[\frac{(2^{x+1}+1)^x}{2^{(x+1)y}}\right] \div \left[\frac{(2^{x+1}+1)^x}{2^{(x+1)(y+1)}}\right] \cdot 2^{x+1}.$$

2. General Description of the Paper

In the following one presents the goals of this dissertation:

- description of classes of functions that can be obtained by the superposition of basic arithmetic functions with different restrictions imposed on their growth and the build-up of formulas;
- bulding up finite superposition bases of a simple form in classes analogous to class $\mathcal{E}^2$ of Grzegorczyk without using the Turing machine numeration;
- researching groups with recursive permutations that are connected with the known classes of recursive functions concerning the subject of finite generability.

The results [7, 8, 23] about bases in class K, regardless of its beauty, simplicity, and that fact that they are simply amazing have a significant downfall: they cannot be applied in real life due to the fact that the class K contains functions with very high computational complexity (for example, x^{y^z}) and is, therefore, a very bad approximation for the class of functions that "can be computed in practice". The technique offered in these papers to a significant extend uses functions with super exponential growth and, thus, does not allow to obtain analogous results for classes significantly smaller than K.

The technique from papers [6, 9, 12] allows to build bases in narrower classes of complexity than K (such as for example $\mathcal{E}^2$ or FP) but these bases turn out to be quite 'bulky' (one of these bases functions is defined based on the numeration of some types of Turing machines). No other ways for obtaining simpler bases in congruent classes were known. Moreover, there was a hypothesis claiming that they cannot be significantly simpler than those built based on the Turing machine numeration.

As was mentioned, a goal of this dissertation is the one of obtaining an "easy" bases that are analogous to those known for K, for narrower classes that estimate the notion of practically effective computability.

In chapter 1 for some classes that can be considered "generalized" complexity classes one builds bases that consist only of the simplest arithmetic

functions and functions that are standard in the majority of programming languages such that in some classes (not closed with respect to superposition) the bases can be obtained by applying restrictions on formulas. In this dissertation, for the first time one investigated the question of describing classes of recursive functions that can be obtained by the superposition of functions with restrictions on the skeleton of the superposition.

Let one consider the following class S. All functions of this class can be computed over the course of an exponential time with linear memory (of the length of the input), thus S gives a much better approximation of practically computable functions than K. The question of existence of finite bases in S remains unanswered but nonetheless one managed to figure out a description of this class in terms of the superposition. In section 1 of the chapter 1 one introduces the class XS. All functions of this class are restricted by functions of the type $2^{p(\tilde{x})}$, where p is a polynomial. S coincides with the set of all functions from XS, bounded by polynomials, thus one calls XS the exponential expansion S. The class XS is not closed with respect to superposition (thus, there cannot be a bases in it). Regardless of that this class is a fairly natural one and has a few equivalent definitions. The main result of the section 1 of chapter 1 is the fact that XS there is a set of all functions that can be expressed in terms of the superposition of functions

$$x+1, \quad xy, \quad x \div y, \quad x \wedge y, \quad [x/y], \quad 2^x,$$

where $x \wedge y$ is a bitwise conjunction of binary representations of x and y with the following restriction on formulas: the formula needs to have a height of no more than 2. The height of the formula is calculated with respect to exponent, i.e for example the height of the formula $x2^{x+yz}+2^t$ equals to 2, and the formula 2^{2^x} it equals to 3.

In section 2 of the chapter 1, one considers the class FFOM that is a functional analog of the class FOM (in English that is "First Order with respect to Majority," see [14]). The class FOM is defined based on the representation of dictionary-based predicates with the help of first order logical formulas with generalized quantifiers for majorizing. For example in [14] there are a few equivalent definitions of class FOM, amongst which there are those defined in terms of complexity theory. All functions from FFOM are bounded by the functions of the type $2^{[\log_2(x_1+\ldots+x_n)]^n}$, i.e. for any func-

tion $f(\tilde{x}) \in$ FFOM the length of input $f(\tilde{x})$ is bounded by a polynomial of input length $\tilde{x}$. Generally speaking, the classes FOM and FFOM can be called "very small". All functions from FFOM are computed within a polynomial time (and, moreover, with a logarithmic space, see [14]). Regardless, FFOM contains the majority of effectively computable functions that can be encountered while practicing mathematics that are suitable with respect to their growth rate. Besides, FFOM has the property of computational completeness, specifically all recursively enumerable sets can be enumerated by functions from FFOM (see for example [14]), FFOM can be considered as a "generalized" complexity class. The main result of section 2 of the chapter 1 is the fact that the system of functions

$$\{x + y, \quad x \div y, \quad x \wedge y, \quad [x/y], \quad 2^{[\log_2 x]^2}\}$$

is a basis with respect to the superposition in FFOM. One can note that FFOM-reducibility is quite strong (see [13, 14]). The analysis of proofs from [2, 18] shows that the majority of known NP-complete, PSPACE-complete, as well as P-complete (with respect for example to reducibility with the logarithmic space) are of this kind also with respect to FFOM-reducibility [1]. This means that what was obtained in section 2 of the chapter 1 is the result that can be used to build bases of a simple kind in many known classes. For example to build a basis in FP it is sufficient to add to the basis in FFOM any FP-complete function with respect to FFOM-reducibility that can be constructed for example based on P-complete problems from [18].

In section 3 of chapter 1, one considers classes of functions that can be represented by formulas analogous to those that one considers in section 1 of this same chapter with an arbitrary height. Thus, this is a hierarchy of classes that is exhaustive of the class K (each height that is bigger or equal to 2 corresponds its own class). In section 3 one considers equivalent definitions of classes in this hierarchy that are based on substituting into functions of classes S and FOM monotonous functions with corresponding speeds of growth.

One can note that for all bases described in chapter 1, there is a function $x \wedge y$, which is a bitwise conjunction that is not in and of itself an "arithmetic one." (although it is in the set of standard arithmetic functions of the

[1] It is known that FOM $\neq$ PSPACE, but the question of coincidence of the classes FOM and NP is at the moment an open one.

majority of programming languages and CPUs). Unfortunately, one cannot get rid of this function analogously to how it was done in [23] for the class K.

The main task of the chapter 2 is building a basis of a simple type in the class $\mathcal{E}^2$ of Grzegorczyk hierarchy [19]. One can notice that (see [13, 14]) functions of a simple type bounded by a polynomial analogous to those that were used to build bases in chapter 1 (for example, $[\sqrt{x}]$, $[\log_x y]$, $\min(x, y^z)$, various easy operations in binary notation or other forms of representation and etc.) are in FFOM and, therefore, are computable with a logarithmic space, that is they are in $\bigcup_{C_1,C_2} \mathrm{FSPACE}(C_1 \log n + C_2)$, where $\mathrm{FSPACE}(f(n))$ is the set of all functions computable on multitape Turing machines that do not record onto input tape and do not read from the output one, with a restriction on space $f(n)$, n is the length of entrance (see [14, 20]). On the other hand, in agreement with [26], $\mathcal{E}^2$ is the set of all functions that are Turing machine computable with a linear space. Thus, from the theorem on hierarchy [20] it follows that if Φ is a basis in $\mathcal{E}^2$ and $f(n) = o(n)$, then in Φ there is a function that is not in $\mathrm{FSPACE}(f(n))$. This means that the basis in $\mathcal{E}^2$ must contain a function that is significantly more complex than the ones considered above, those being "simple arithmetic" ones. In chapter 2, there is an example of a basis that consists of simple arithmetic functions and a special function $Q(x, p_1, p_2, c_1, c_2, t)$. Function Q is defined with the help of primitive recursion, its definition is a very simple one and it does not contain in an explicit way any type of Turing machine numeration. The function Q in some sense is quasi-universal in $\mathcal{E}^2$ (the definition of quasi-universality is slightly different from the one introduced by A. A. Muchnik in [12]). One can note that the function Q is interesting also as a very simple example of PSPACE-equivalent function (see [2].)

In chapter 3, one investigates special classes of functions, the classes of permutations. More specifically one considers groups of permutations $\mathrm{Gr}(Q) = \{f : f, f^{-1} \in Q\}$ for classes Q, closed with respect to the superposition and those that contain an identity function. The main result of the chapter 3 is the proof of finite generability $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ for a big family

of classes Q (that satisfy specific requirements). The requirements have a purely "functional" character, one makes no assumptions about the computability of functions from Q. The proof of this statement is constructive, the permutations of the generating set are being built from functions of basis in Q, numerating functions as well as some basic arithmetic functions. A special interest is classes Q being an estimation of the class of functions that is computable in practice. In this case, $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ is the set of all effective non-redundant codes $\mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0$ that allow for effective decoding. Such codes are used both for compressing information and encoding it. Searching for finite generating sets of such groups gives a lot of information about the structure of these groups as well as it gives an easy and effective method for enumerating elements of these groups.

In chapter 3 one proves finite generability of the group $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ for classes FP, FFOM, generalizations of the Grzegorczyk classes and etc. One can note that the classes of permutations $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ are subclasses of classes of single valued functions $Q^{(1)}$, the existence of bases in $Q^{(1)}$ for a big family of classes Q is proved in [4]. When proving finite generability $Q^{(1)}$ in [4] one uses the fact that the superposition allows to select from functions an information that is required and to get rid of the unnecessary, for example the value $f(g(x))$ is not dependent on the values of function f when using arguments that do not belong to the image of g. This allows one to use quasi-universal functions that are analogous to those that are used in papers [9, 12, 6], i.e. functions that contain in a sense the information about all functions from $Q^{(1)}$ (with the help of auxiliary functions one can extract that part of information from the quasi-universal one that corresponds to some specific function and with the help of other axillary functions one can build the needed function). For classes of permutations such method does not work, to prove finite generbility $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ one uses a new method, that was generated specifically in the framework of this dissertation.

Of a special interest is the problem of minimizing the generating set. In chapter 3 one proves that for the same requirements for Q the cardinality of the minimal generating set equals to two (more specifically, only the upper bound is proved, the lower bound follows for example from the non-commutativity). Moreover, it is proved that there exists a two-element set

that generates $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ in a functional sense, i.e. the basis with respect to superposition of two functions.

The main results of this dissertation were presented at international conferences "Discrete Models in Control Systems Theory" (Moscow, 2006), "Problems of Theoretical Cybernetics" (Kazan, 2008), research seminar at the Institute for Information Transmission Problems, research seminar at the Department of Mathematical Logic and Theory of Algorithms at the Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, research seminar at the Department of Mathematical Cybernetics at the Faculty of Computational Mathematics and Cybernetics, Lomonosov Moscow state University, published in papers [32–36].

3. Summary of the Main Results

3.1. Basic definitions

For the reader's convenience some of the definitions here and in other parts of the paper repeat the ones introduced in the review part.

Let $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. One considers everywhere defined functions (with an arbitrary number of arguments) on the set of $\mathbb{N}_0$. Under the operation of superposition one means the substitution of functions into functions, permutation and identification of variables, introduction of dummy variables.

Let Q be an arbitrary class of functions over $\mathbb{N}_0$. One will denote through $[Q]$ the closure over superposition of the class Q.

Let there be some set Ψ of functions closed under the superposition and $\Phi \subseteq \Psi$. One considers that the Φ set generated the set Ψ if $[\Phi] = \Psi$. Finite sets generating Ψ are called *finite superposition basis* in the set Ψ.

Let one assume that

$$x \div y = \max(x - y, 0),$$

$$\mathrm{sg}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 0 & \text{else}, \end{cases}$$

$$\overline{\mathrm{sg}}(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 1, & \text{if } x = 0, \end{cases}$$

$$\mathrm{rm}(x,y)=\begin{cases}\text{remainder from dividing } x \text{ by } y, \text{ if } y>0,\\ 0 \text{ else,}\end{cases}$$

$$[\log_2 x]=\begin{cases}\text{integer part of a binary logarithm } x, \text{ if } x>0,\\ 0 \text{ else,}\end{cases}$$

$$x\langle y\rangle = y\text{-th binary digit of } x$$

$$(\text{therefore, } x=\sum_{y=0}^{\infty} x\langle y\rangle\cdot 2^y\,),$$

$$\mathrm{len}(x)=([\log_2 x]+1)\cdot \mathrm{sg}(x). \tag{4}$$

One can see that $\mathrm{len}(x)$ equals to the length of the binary notation for x if $x>0$ and zero otherwise. Let one define the function $x\wedge y$ as the bit-wise conjunction of the binary representations of numbers x and y. Let there be $a_n a_{n-1}\ldots a_0$, $b_n b_{n-1}\ldots b_0$ as binary representations of numbers x and y (if the lengths of the binary representations are different, then the most significant bit of the binary representation of the smaller number equals to zero). Thus, the binary representation of a number $x\wedge y$ is

$$(a_n\cdot b_n)(a_{n-1}\cdot b_{n-1})\ldots(a_0\cdot b_0).$$

By characteristic function of the predicate $\rho(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ we call the function $\chi_\rho(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ such that for any $x_1,\ldots,x_n$

$$\chi_\rho(x_1,\ldots,x_n)=\begin{cases}1, \text{ if } \rho(x_1,\ldots,x_n) \text{ is true,}\\ 0, \text{ otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

For the class of functions Q by Q_* one denotes the set of all predicates, which characteristic functions lie in Q.

One claims that the function $f(x_1,\ldots,x_n,y)$ is obtained from the functions $g(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$, $h(x_1,\ldots,x_n,y,z)$, $j(x_1,\ldots,x_n,y)$ with the help of using the operation called *bounded recursion* if the following relations hold true

$$\begin{cases} f(x_1,\ldots,x_n,0)=g(x_1,\ldots,x_n),\\ f(x_1,\ldots,x_n,y+1)=h(x_1,\ldots,x_n,y,f(x_1,\ldots,x_n,y)),\\ f(x_1,\ldots,x_n,y)\leqslant j(x_1,\ldots,x_n,y).\end{cases}$$

Let us define classes $\mathcal{E}^n$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}_0$) of the Grzegorczyk hierarchy [19]. $\mathcal{E}^n$ is the minimal class of functions which contains the functions $x+1$, $f_n(x,y)$ and is closed with respect to superposition and limited recursion where

$$f_0(x,y) = y+1,$$

$$f_1(x,y) = x+y,$$

$$f_2(x,y) = (x+1)\cdot(y+1),$$

for $n \geqslant 2$

$$f_{n+1}(0,y) = f_n(y+1, y+1),$$

$$f_{n+1}(x+1,y) = f_{n+1}(x, f_{n+1}(x,y)).$$

For tuples of variables (and their parts), one uses abbreviations of the form $\tilde{x}$, $\tilde{y}$, etc. (for example, $(\tilde{x},t)$ is $(x_1,\ldots,x_n,t)$.)

3.2. Main results of Chapter 1

One can say that the function $f(x,z_1,\ldots,z_n)$ can be obtained from the function $g(y,z_1,\ldots,z_n)$ with the help of an operation called *bounded summation* with respect to the y variable if

$$f(x,z_1,\ldots,z_n) = \sum_{y\leqslant x} g(y,z_1,\ldots,z_n).$$

The class S of the *Skolem elementary* functions (see [10, 28, 29]) is a minimal class of functions that contains functions

$$0, \quad x+1, \quad x \div y \tag{5}$$

and is closed with respect to superposition and bounded summation. One can note that S coincides with the minimal class that contains functions (5) and is closed with respect to superposition and summation of the form $\sum_{x<y}$ (summation over an empty set equals to zero), for convenience one will use specifically this definition.

For every set of functions Q one can define sequences of classes $[Q]^n_{2^x}$ and $[Q]^n_{x^y}$ ($n = 0,1,2,\ldots$) inductively.

1. $[Q]^0_{x^y} = [Q]^0_{2^x} = [Q]$.

2. If $f \in [Q]^n_{2^x}$ ($[Q]^n_{x^y}$), then $f \in [Q]^{n+1}_{2^x}$ ($[Q]^{n+1}_{x^y}$).

3. If $f \in [Q]^n_{2^x}$ ($f \in [Q]^n_{x^y}$) and g is obtained from f by permuting, identifying variables, or introducing dummy variables, then $g \in [Q]^n_{2^x}$ ($g \in [Q]^n_{x^y}$).

4. If $f(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \in Q$ and $g_1(x_1, \ldots, x_k), \ldots, g_m(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in [Q]^n_{2^x}$ ($[Q]^n_{x^y}$), then

$$f(g_1(x_1, \ldots, x_k), \ldots, g_m(x_1, \ldots, x_k)) \in [Q]^n_{2^x} \ ([Q]^n_{x^y}).$$

5. If $f \in [Q]^{n+1}_{x^y}$, $g \in [Q]^n_{x^y}$, $h \in [Q]^n_{2^x}$, then $2^h \in [Q]^{n+1}_{2^x}$ and $f^g \in [Q]^{n+1}_{x^y}$.

For $[Q]^1_{2^x}$ and $[Q]^1_{x^y}$ one can use contracted notation $[Q]_{2^x}$ and $[Q]_{x^y}$ respectively.

One can introduce a sequence of classes P^n ($n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$) inductively.

1. P^0 is the class of all polynomials.

2. P^{n+1} is the class of all functions of the type 2^f, where $f \in \mathrm{P}^n$.

One can define the class XS^n ($n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$) as a class of all functions $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, for which they satisfy the following conditions:

1. f is bounded by some function from P^{n+1}.

2. There exist functions $m(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathrm{P}_n$ and $g(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, z) \in \mathrm{S}$, such that

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\langle y\rangle = g(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, m(x_1, \ldots, x_n)).$$

XS one can define the class of all functions as $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, for which the following conditions hold true:

1. There exists a polynomial $p(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ with natural coefficients such that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ it is true that the inequality

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) < 2^{p(x_1, \ldots, x_n)}.$$

2. $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\langle y\rangle \in \mathrm{S}$.

It is obvious that $\mathrm{S} \subseteq \mathrm{XS}$ and $\mathrm{XS}^0 = \mathrm{XS}$ (this can be proved using the technique from [10].)

One can assume that

$$T = \{x + 1, \quad xy, \quad x \div y, \quad x \wedge y, \quad [x/y]\}.$$

Theorem 1. $\mathrm{XS} = [T]_{2^x} = [T]_{x^y}$.

This theorem is proved in section 1 of chapter 1.

If A is some alphabet, then one can denote A^+ as the set of all finite non-empty words in the alphabet A. If X is a word in the alphabet A, then one can denote $|X|$ as the length of this word.

One can name FOM-*term* over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ the expression of form $x_1, \ldots, x_m, 1, |X|$.

Definition. Expressions of the form $(t_1 \leqslant t_2)$, $\mathrm{BIT}(t_1, t_2)$ or $\mathrm{X}\langle t_1 \rangle$, where t_1, t_2 are FOM-terms over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, are called *elementary* FOM-*formulas* over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$.

One can inductively define the notion of FOM-formula over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$.[2]

1. All elementary FOM-formulas over $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ are FOM-formulas over $x_1, \ldots, x_m$.
2. If Φ_1, Φ_2 are FOM-formulas over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, $x_i \in \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$, then $(\Phi_1 \& \Phi_2)$, $(\Phi_1 \vee \Phi_2)$, $(\neg\Phi_1)$, $(\exists x_i)(\Phi_1)$, $(\forall x_i)(\Phi_1)$, $(\mathrm{M}x_i)(\Phi_1)$ are FOM-formulas over $x_1, \ldots, x_m$.

To every FOM-term t over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ one will match up the function $h_t(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, which is defined over the set of all arrays $(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ such that $X \in \{0, 1\}^+$ and $1 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_m \leqslant |X|$, in the following way.

1. If t is 1, then
$$h_t(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) = 1.$$

[2] In the list of variables, there are not only free but also bound variables, technically it is more convenient.

2. If t is $|X|$, then
$$h_t(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) = |X|.$$

3. If t is x_i, then
$$h_t(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) = x_i.$$

For every elementary FOM-formula Φ over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ one can match up the predicate $\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, the domain of which coincides with the domain of the function for FOM-terms over $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, in the following way.

1. If Φ is of the type $(t_1 \leqslant t_2)$, then
$$\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv (h_{t_1}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \leqslant h_{t_2}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)).$$

2. If Φ is of the type $\mathrm{BIT}(t_1, t_2)$, then
$$\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv (h_{t_1}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)\langle h_{t_2}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) - 1\rangle = 1).$$

3. If Φ is of the type $\mathrm{X}\langle t_1\rangle$, then

   $\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv (h_{t_1}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$-s symbol of the word X equals 1),

   where the numeration of the symbols starts with one (and one numerates symbols left to right).

Every FOM-formula Φ over variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ matches the predicate $\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, the domain of which coincides with the domain of the function for FOM-terms over $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, in the following way.

1. If the formula is elementary FOM-formula, then its corresponding predicate coincides with the predicate that is defined for the given elementary formula.

2. If Φ is of the type $(\Phi_1 \& \Phi_2)$, then
$$\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv \rho_{\Phi_1}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \& \rho_{\Phi_2}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m).$$

3. If Φ is of type $(\Phi_1 \vee \Phi_2)$, then
$$\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv \rho_{\Phi_1}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \vee \rho_{\Phi_2}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m).$$

4. If Φ is of type $(\neg\Phi_1)$, then

$$\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv \neg\rho_{\Phi_1}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m).$$

5. If Φ is of type $(\exists x_i)(\Phi_1)$, then

$$\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv (\exists x)_{(1\leqslant x\leqslant |X|)}\rho_{\Phi_1}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_m).$$

6. If Φ is of type $(\forall x_i)(\Phi_1)$, then

$$\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv (\forall x)_{(1\leqslant x\leqslant |X|)}\rho_{\Phi_1}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_m).$$

7. If Φ is of type $(\mathrm{M}x_i)(\Phi_1)$, then $\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is true if and only if when the number of x such that $1 \leqslant x \leqslant |X|$ and $\rho_{\Phi_1}(X, x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_m)$ is truly greater than $|X|/2$.

The FOM (see [14]) is defined at the set of everywhere defined over the set $\{0,1\}^+$ predicates $\varphi(X)$, for which there exists FOM-formula that corresponds to the predicate $\rho(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ such that for any $X, x_1, \ldots, x_m$ from its domain

$$\varphi(X) \equiv \rho(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m).$$

If $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ are natural numbers, then one can denote $\mathrm{CODE}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ word

$$01s_101s_201\ldots01s_m01,$$

where

$$s_i = \begin{cases} \text{to an empty word if } x_i = 0, \\ \text{to the word that one obtains from binary notation } x_i \\ \qquad \text{by substituting each one by 11,} \\ \qquad \text{and every zero by 00, if } x_i \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

The class FOM^N can be defined as the set of everywhere defined over the set $\mathbb{N}_0$ predicates $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, for which there exist a predicate $\psi(X) \in \mathrm{FOM}$ such that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ it satisfies

$$\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \equiv \psi(\mathrm{CODE}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)).$$

The class FFOM can be defined as the set of everywhere defined over the set $\mathbb{N}_0$ functions $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ such that the following two conditions are satisfied.

1. There exists a polynomial $p(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ such that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n$

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \leqslant 2^{p([\log_2(x_1)], \ldots, [\log_2(x_n)])}.$$

2. The predicate ρ that can be defined by the following relation

$$\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y) \equiv (f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\langle y \rangle = 1),$$

is in FOM^N.

Theorem 2. *The following takes place*

$$\mathrm{FFOM} = \left[x + y, \quad x \div y, \quad x \wedge y, \quad [x/y], \quad 2^{[\log_2 x]^2}\right] =$$

$$= \left[x + y, \quad x \div y, \quad x \wedge y, \quad [x/y], \quad x^{[\log_2 y]}\right].$$

This theorem is proved in section 2 of the chapter 1.

One can introduce the following sequence of classes P^n $(n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots)$ inductively.

1. P^0 is the class of all polynomials.
2. P^{n+1} is the class of all functions of the type 2^f, where $f \in \mathrm{P}^n$.

One can define the class FFOM^n $(n = 1, 2, \ldots)$ as a class of all upper-bounded by functions from P^n functions $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, for which there exists a function $m(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathrm{P}^n$ and a predicate $\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, z) \in \mathrm{FOM}^N$ such that

$$(f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\langle y \rangle = 1) \equiv \rho(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, m(x_1, \ldots, x_n)).$$

Theorem 3. *For any $n \geqslant 0$ there is*

$$\mathrm{XS}^n = [T]^{n+1}_{2^x} = [T]^{n+1}_{x^y} = \mathrm{FFOM}^{n+1}.$$

This theorem is a generalization of theorem 1 and is proved in section 3 of chapter 1.

3.3. Main results of Chapter 2

One can define $R(x,\, y)$ as a cyclic shift of a binary representation of the number x by y digits to the right. In other words, let $R(0,\, y) = 0,\ R(1,\, y) = 1,$ and if $x \geqslant 2$ and $a_n a_{n-1} \ldots a_1 a_0$ is the binary representation $x,$ such that $a_n = 1,$ then the binary notation $R(x,\, y)$ is

$$a_{n+y} a_{n+y-1} \ldots a_{1+y} a_y,$$

where all additions go mod $n + 1$.

From [19] it follows that the functions

$$\mathrm{sg}(x), \quad \overline{\mathrm{sg}}(x), \quad x \div y, \quad \left[\frac{x}{y}\right], \quad [\log_2 x], \quad \min(x, 2^y), \quad \mathrm{rm}(x, y)$$

belong to Grzegorczyk class $\mathcal{E}^2$.

With the help of for example the operation of bounded summation [10] it is not difficult to show that the function $x \wedge y,\ R(x,\, y)$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{E}^2$.

Let one define the function $Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t)$ by the following primitive recursion:

$$\begin{cases} Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, 0) = x, \\ Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t+1) = \\ \quad = \begin{cases} Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t), \text{ if } Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \wedge R(p_1,\, c_1 \cdot t) \neq 0, \\ Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) + R(p_2,\, c_2 \cdot t) \ \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

Since $Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \leqslant x + 2p_2 t,$ then one has a bounded recursion in the class $\mathcal{E}^2$ and, thereby, $Q \in \mathcal{E}^2$.

A function $Q(x_1,\, x_2,\, \ldots,\, x_m)$ from the class $\mathcal{E}^2$ one will name *quasi-universal* in the class $\mathcal{E}^2$ relative to the system of the functions Φ if for any function $f(\tilde{y})$ from the class $\mathcal{E}^2$ one can find functions $h(x,\, \tilde{y}),\ g_1(\tilde{y}),\ g_2(\tilde{y}),\ \ldots,\ g_m(\tilde{y})$ from the set $\Phi,$ such that

$$f(\tilde{y}) = h(Q(g_1(\tilde{y}),\, g_2(\tilde{y}),\, \ldots,\, g_m(\tilde{y})), \tilde{y}).$$

Theorem 4. *The function $Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t)$ is a quasi-universal one in the class $\mathcal{E}^2$ with respect to closure by the superposition of the system of*

functions

$$x+1, \quad xy, \quad \min(x,\, 2^y), \quad x \div y, \quad \left[\frac{x}{y}\right], \quad [\log_2 x]\,. \tag{6}$$

Consequence. *The system of functions*

$$x+1, \quad xy, \quad \min(x,\, 2^y), \quad x \div y, \quad \left[\frac{x}{y}\right], \quad [\log_2 x]\,, \quad Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t)$$

forms a basis with respect to superposition in the Grzegorczyk class $\mathcal{E}^2$*.*

3.4. Main results of Chapter 3

Under the term *permutation* one assumes a permutation over the set $\mathbb{N}_0$.

For any class Q, which is closed with respect to superposition and contains the function $I(x) = x$, by $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ one can denote the group of permutations $(\{f :\ f, f^{-1} \in Q\},\ \circ)$.

Definition. An infinite set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$ is *regular* in the class of functions Q if it satisfies two conditions:

1. $\chi_A \in Q$;
2. One can enumerate elements of the set A in such a way that $\mu(x)$ that calculates the number of the element x in this numeration (equals to zero for $x \notin A$) and the function $\nu(x)$ that calculates an element with the number x belong to Q (enumeration starts with zero).

One considers classes of functions Q that satisfy the following requirements:

I. Q contains functions

$$1, \quad x+y, \quad x \div y, \quad x \cdot \operatorname{sg} y, \quad [x/2]; \tag{7}$$

II. Q contains an enumerating function $c_2(x_1, x_2)$ that mutually exclusively maps the set $\mathbb{N}_0^2$ to $\mathbb{N}_0$ and its inverse functions $c_{2,1}(x)$ and $c_{2,2}(x)$ ($c_{2,1}(c_2(x,y)) = x,\ c_{2,2}(c_2(x,y)) = y$ for any $x,\ y$);

III. For any permutation $f \in \mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ there exist non-intersecting regular in Q sets A, B such that $f(A) \cap B = \varnothing$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 \backslash A$, $\mathbb{N}_0 \backslash B$ are regular in Q;

IV. Q is closed with respect to superposition;

V. Q has a finite basis with respect to superposition.

One can notice that the requirements are not independent (for example IV follows from V). Nonetheless, one considers all requirements so that one can show for some statements that they hold true for quite weak restrictions on Q (see chapter 3).

Theorem 5. *If the class Q satisfies the requirements* I–III, V*, then there exist two permutations from* $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$*, with compositions of which one can represent any permutation from* $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$*.*

Let FP be the set of all functions $\mathbb{N}_0^n \to \mathbb{N}_0$ computable on Turing machine and its running time is upper bounded by a polynomial expression in the size of the input for the algorithm (the number is expressed in binary code). Similarly, FL the set of all functions computable with the space $O(\log n)$, where n is the input length (for multitape Turing machine not recording on the input tape). Besides, one uses the definition of the class FFOM from the section 3.2 of Introduction.

The class of functions Q is called $\mathcal{E}^2$*-closed* if it contains the following functions

$$0, \quad x+1, \quad xy$$

and is closed with regards to superposition and bounded recursion.

Theorem 6. *Classes* FP, FL, FFOM *as well as $\mathcal{E}^2$-closed classes that have a finite basis with respect to superposition satisfy the requirements* I–III, V*.*

Consequence. *For classes Q from the theorem 6 the group* $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ *is generated by two permutations (also, in a functional sense, i.e. with the help of using only composition).*

Chapter 1.

Generating Classes by Superposition of Simple Arithmetic Functions

1. Exponential Expansion of the Class of Skolem Elementary Functions and a Formula of Height two

1.1. Definitions

For basic definitions one can check sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the introduction.

Definition. Predicate $\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is a *correct* one if there exists a function $f(y) \in [T]_{2^x}$ such that for any $y \geqslant 1$

$$f(y) = \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1 < y} \ldots \sum_{0 \leqslant x_n < y} (\chi_\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_n) 2^{x_1 + x_2 y + \ldots + x_n y^{n-1}}).$$

In this case the function f is called the *generating function* of the predicate ρ.

Further, the generating function of any predicate ρ will be denoted as f_ρ.

Definition. Function $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is called *T-polynomial* with respect to the set of variables $\{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}\}$ if for any functions $g_1(\tilde{y}), \ldots, g_n(\tilde{y})$ from satisfying relations

$$\begin{array}{l} g_i \in [T]_{2^x}\,, \text{ if } i \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}, \\ g_i \in [T]\,, \text{ if } i \notin \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}, \end{array} \qquad (1 \leqslant i \leqslant n)$$

it follows that

$$f(g_1(\tilde{y}), \ldots, g_n(\tilde{y})) \in [T]_{2^x}\,.$$

By *explicit transformations* one understands operations of permutation and identification of variables, introduction of dummy variables, and constants substitution (from the set $\mathbb{N}_0$) in place of variables.

One can say that the predicate $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y)$ can be obtained from the predicate $\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ with the help of *counting operation* with respect to the variable x_i and a polynomial $p(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ if for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the value $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y)$ holds true if and only if y is the number of such x that $x < p(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and $\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n)$ hold true.

Let $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ be a minimal class of predicates that contains predicates $x + y = z$ and $xy = z$, closed with respect to explicit transformations, logical operations and operations of counting.

The class BA (see [10]) can be defined as a minimal class of predicates that contains predicates $x+y = z$, $xy = z$ and closed with respect to explicit transformational logical operations and bounded quantifications of the form $(\exists x)_{x<y}$ and $(\forall x)_{x<y}$.

The *graph* of the function $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is a predicate of the type $y = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

Let $\mathrm{BA}_f^{\#}$ be the set of all functions upper-bounded by polynomials, the graphs of which are in $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$.

One can say that the function $f(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ is obtained from the function $g(y, z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ with the help of the operation called *narrowed bounded summation* if for any $x, z_1, \ldots, z_n \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$f(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n) = \begin{cases} \sum\limits_{y<x} \mathrm{sg}(g(y, z_1, \ldots, z_n)), \text{ if } x > 0, \\ 0, \text{ if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

One can assume that

$$(\mu x_i)_{x_i<y}(f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = z) =$$

$$= \begin{cases} \text{minimal of these values } x_i, \text{ such that } x_i < y \text{ and} \\ \qquad f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = z \text{ if such } x_i \text{ exists}, \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The operation μ is called the operation *of bounded minimization.*

1.2. Inclusion $[T]_{x^y} \subseteq \mathrm{XS}$

Statement 1.1.2.1. *The function* $x\langle y\rangle$ *lies in* S. *Besides, the predicate* $(x\langle y\rangle = 1)$ *is in* S_*.

Proof. Indeed, it is clear that

$$(x\langle y\rangle = 1) \equiv (\exists z)_{z\leqslant x}(\exists t)_{t<z}(\exists u)_{u\leqslant x}((x = 2uz + z + t)\&(z = 2^y)).$$

From [10] it is known that $(x = 2uz + z + t)$ and $(z = 2^y)$ are in BA. From this it follows that $(x\langle y\rangle = 1) \in \mathrm{BA} \subseteq \mathrm{S}_*$. From this and from the fact that $x\langle y\rangle$ takes values 0 and 1, it follows that is the statement that one wants to prove. □

Statement 1.1.2.2. *The class* S *is closed with respect to bounded minimization.*

Proof. See [10]. □

Statement 1.1.2.3. *If* $f(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{XS}$, *then* $\mathrm{len}(f(\tilde{x})) \in \mathrm{S}$.

Proof. Let $p(\tilde{x})$ be a polynomial that is upper bounded (strictly) the length of binary notation $f(\tilde{x})$ (the existence of such polynomial follows from the definition of XS). Then it is obvious that

$$\mathrm{len}(f(\tilde{x})) = (\mu z)_{z<p(\tilde{x})}(f(\tilde{x}) < 2^z).$$

From [10] it is known that

$$(x < 2^y) \in \mathrm{S}_*.$$

From this and from the statement 1.1.2.2 follows the statement that one is proving. □

Statement 1.1.2.4. *Let* $g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z}) \in \mathrm{XS}$, t *be a* FOM*-term over variables* $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, *it corresponds to a function* $h_t(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$. *Then*

$$h_t(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathrm{S}.$$

Proof. Everywhere defined

$$h_t(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m)$$

follows from the fact that the domain of CODE does not contain an empty word. One can prove that the needed function belongs to S. There can be the following cases.

1. t is 1. Then it is obvious that

   $$h_t(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) = 1.$$

   The S affiliation is obvious.

2. t is $|X|$. Then

   $$h_t(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) =$$
   $$= 2 \cdot (\mathrm{len}(g_1(\tilde{z})) + \ldots + \mathrm{len}(g_k(\tilde{z})) + k + 1)$$

   (see the definitions of CODE and h_t). Affiliation to the class S follows from the statement 1.1.2.3.

3. t looks like x_i. Then

   $$h_t(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) = x_i.$$

   Affiliation to the class S is obvious.

The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.2.5. *Let* $g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z}) \in \mathrm{XS}$, Φ *is an elementary* FOM*-formula over the variables* $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, *it has a corresponding predicate* $\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$. *Then*

$$\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathrm{S}_*.$$

Proof. Everywhere defined predicate

$$\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m)$$

follows from the fact that the domain of CODE doesn not contain an empty word. One can prove the affiliation to the class S_*. There can be different cases.

1. Φ is of the type $(t_1 = t_2)$. Then

$$\rho_\Phi \equiv (h_{t_1} = h_{t_2}).$$

Affiliation to the class S_* follows from the statement 1.1.2.4 and from the fact that $(x = y) \in \mathrm{BA} \subseteq \mathrm{S}_*$ (see [10]).

2. Φ look like $(t_1 \leqslant t_2)$. Analogously.

3. Φ looks like $\mathrm{BIT}(t_1, t_2)$. From the statement 1.1.2.1 it follows that $(x\langle y\rangle = 1) \in \mathrm{S}_*$. From the definition of ρ_Φ follows the representation

$$\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv$$

$$\equiv (h_{t_1}(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), \tilde{x})$$

$$\langle h_{t_2}(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), \tilde{x}) - 1\rangle = 1).$$

From here, from the statement 1.1.2.4 and from the fact that $(x\langle y\rangle = 1) \in \mathrm{S}_*$, it follows that

$$\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathrm{S}_*.$$

4. Φ looks like $\mathrm{X}\langle t_1\rangle$. Briefly $h_{t_1}(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ will be denoted simply as h_{t_1} and ρ_Φ, while expressions $2 \cdot \mathrm{len}(g_i(\tilde{z}))$ will be denoted l_i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant k)$. Then from definitions of CODE and ρ_Φ it follows that

$$\rho_\Phi \equiv \begin{cases} (g_i(\tilde{z}) \left\langle \left[\frac{h_{t_1} \div (2i + l_1 + \ldots + l_{i-1} + 1)}{2} \right] \right\rangle = 1), \text{ if} \\ \qquad 2i + l_1 + \ldots + l_{i-1} + 1 \leqslant h_{t_1} < \\ \qquad < 2i + l_1 + \ldots + l_{i-1} + l_i + 1, \ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant k, \\ \text{true, if } h_{t_1} = 2i + l_1 + \ldots + l_i + 2, \ 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k, \\ \text{false else.} \end{cases}$$

Based on induction proposal, $h_{t_1} \in \mathrm{S}$. From here, from inclusions $g_i \in \mathrm{XS}$, from the definition of XS and from the simplest features of the class S (see [10]) it follows that for any i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant k)$

$$g_i(\tilde{z}) \left\langle \left[\frac{h_{t_1} \div (2i + l_1 + \ldots + l_{i-1} + 1)}{2} \right] \right\rangle \in \mathrm{S}.$$

Besides, according to the statement 1.1.2.3, $l_i \in \mathrm{S}$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant k)$. From here and from the closeness of S relative to breaking down cases with respect to predicates from S_* (see [10]) it follows that $\rho_\Phi \in \mathrm{S}$.

The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.2.6. *Let* $g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z}) \in \mathrm{XS}$, Φ *is a* FOM*-formula over variables* $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, *to which there is a corresponding predicate* $\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$. *Then*

$$\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathrm{S}_*.$$

Proof. Everywhere defined predicate $\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ it follows from the fact that the domain of CODE does not contain an empty word. Let l be a contracted notation for

$$2 \cdot (\mathrm{len}(g_1(\tilde{z})) + \ldots + \mathrm{len}(g_k(\tilde{z})) + k + 1).$$

From the statement 1.1.2.3 it follows that $l \in \mathrm{S}$. Affiliation to the class S_* can be proved by inducting on the construction of the formula.

1. Φ is an elementary FOM-formula. Then this formula follows from the statement 1.1.2.5.

2. Φ is of the form $(\Phi_1 \& \Phi_2)$, $(\Phi_1 \vee \Phi_2)$ or $(\neg\Phi_1)$. The statement follows from the close of S_* with respect to logical operations (see [10]).

3. Φ is of the form $(\exists x_i)\Phi_1$. Then

$$\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv$$

$$\equiv (\exists x)_{(1 \leqslant x \leqslant l)} \rho_{\Phi_1}(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_m).$$

   Affiliation with the class S_* follows from the fact that $l \in \mathrm{S}$, and from the closeness of S_* with respect to bounded quantification (see [10]).

4. Φ is of the type $(\forall x_i)(\Phi_1)$. Then the given statement is a consequence from items 2 and 3.

5. Φ is of the form $(\mathrm{M}x_i)(\Phi_1)$. Let

$$r(\tilde{z}, x_1, \ldots, x_m) =$$

$$= \sum_{1 \leqslant x \leqslant l} \chi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_m),$$

where χ is the characteristic function of the predicate ρ_{Φ_1}. It is obvious that $r(\tilde{z}, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is the number of x such that $1 \leqslant x \leqslant l$ and

$$\rho_{\Phi_1}(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_m)$$

holds true. From the definition of S, the induction step and the fact that $l \in \mathrm{S}$, it follows that $r \in \mathrm{S}$. From the definition of ρ_Φ it follows that

$$\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv$$
$$\equiv (r(\tilde{z}, x_1, \ldots, x_m) > l \div r(\tilde{z}, x_1, \ldots, x_m)).$$

Therefore from $(x \div y) \in \mathrm{S}$ and from $(x > y) \in \mathrm{S}_*$ it follows that $\rho_\Phi \in \mathrm{S}_*$.

The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.2.7. *Let* $g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z}) \in \mathrm{XS}$, $\rho(y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathrm{FOM}^N$. *Then the predicate*

$$\varphi(\tilde{z}) = \rho(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z}))$$

is in S_*.

Proof. From the definition of FOM^N it follows that there exists such predicate $\psi(X)$ from FOM that

$$\rho(y_1, \ldots, y_n) \equiv \psi(\mathrm{CODE}(y_1, \ldots, y_n)).$$

From the definition of FOM it follows that there exists FOM-formula Φ, to which there is a corresponding predicate $\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ such that

$$\rho_\Phi(X, x_1, \ldots, x_m) \equiv \psi(X).$$

Thereby,

$$\rho(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})) \equiv \rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{z})), x_1, \ldots, x_m).$$

From the statement 1.1.2.6 it follows that

$$\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}(g_1(\tilde{z}),\ldots,g_k(\tilde{z})),x_1,\ldots,x_m)\in \mathrm{S}_*.$$

The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.2.8. *Let* $g_1(\tilde{z}),\ldots,g_k(\tilde{z})\in \mathrm{XS}$, $f(y_1,\ldots,y_n)\in \mathrm{FFOM}$. *Then*

$$h(\tilde{z})=f(g_1(\tilde{z}),\ldots,g_k(\tilde{z}))\in \mathrm{XS}.$$

Proof. The boundedness $h(\tilde{z})$ by functions of the form $2^{p(\tilde{z})}$, where p is a polynomial, follows from restrictions in definitions of XS and FFOM. One can prove that $(h(\tilde{z})\langle t\rangle=1)\in \mathrm{S}_*$. Indeed, it is obvious that

$$(h(\tilde{z})\langle t\rangle=1)\equiv \xi(g_1(\tilde{z}),\ldots,g_k(\tilde{z}),t),$$

where

$$\xi(y_1,\ldots,y_m,t)\equiv (f(y_1,\ldots,y_m)\langle t\rangle=1).$$

From the definition of FFOM it follows that $\xi\in \mathrm{FOM}^N$. From that and the statement 1.1.2.7 it follows that

$$\xi(g_1(\tilde{z}),\ldots,g_k(\tilde{z}),t)\in \mathrm{S}_*.$$

And this is equivalent to the fact that

$$h(\tilde{z})\langle t\rangle\in \mathrm{S}$$

(because $h(\tilde{z})\langle t\rangle$ takes only values 0 and 1). From this and the definition of XS it follows that $h\in \mathrm{XS}$. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.2.9. *Functions*

$$x+1,\quad x\div y,\quad xy,\quad x\wedge y,\quad [x/y],\quad x^{\mathrm{len}(y)}$$

are in the class FFOM.

Proof. For the function $x\wedge y$ it obviously follows from equivalent definitions of the class FOM (for example through the boolean circuits, see [14]). For the remaining functions the proof is in [13]. □

Statement 1.1.2.10. *If* $f(\tilde{x})\in \mathrm{S}$, *then* $2^{f(\tilde{x})}\div 1\in \mathrm{XS}$.

Proof. The verity of the upper bound on the speed of growth is clear. From the simplistic features of binary notation of numbers it follows that the following holds

$$((2^{f(\tilde{x})} \div 1)\langle y\rangle = 1) \equiv (y < f(\tilde{x})).$$

It is obvious that the predicate $(x < y)$ is in S_* (see [10]). Therefore

$$(y < f(\tilde{x})) \in \mathrm{S}_*.$$

From this one sees the validity of the statement that one was proving. □

Theorem 7. *The following inclusion takes place* $[T]_{x^y} \subseteq \mathrm{XS}$.

Proof. One can prove this statement by induction on constructing functions in the class $[T]_{x^y}$. Let $h \in [T]_{x^y}$. Then there can be different cases.

1. $h \in T$. Then obviously (see for example [10]) that $h \in \mathrm{S}$. From $\mathrm{S} \subseteq \mathrm{XS}$ it follows that $h \in \mathrm{XS}$.

2. h is obtained from f by permuting, identifying variables or introducing dummy variables, $f \in \mathrm{XS}$. In this case the inclusion $h \in \mathrm{XS}$ follows from the fact that the class S is closed with respect to superposition (specifically, permutation, identification of variables, introduction of dummy variables).

3. $h(\tilde{x}) = f(g_1(\tilde{x}), \ldots, g_m(\tilde{x}))$, where $f \in T$, $g_1, \ldots, g_m \in \mathrm{XS}$. In this case from statements 1.1.2.9 and 1.1.2.8 follows that $h \in \mathrm{XS}$.

4. $h = f^g$, where $f \in \mathrm{XS}$, $g \in [T]$. Then this can be written as

   $$h = f^{\mathrm{len}(2^g \div 1)}.$$

   It is obvious that $g \in \mathrm{S}$ (see [10]), thus $2^g \div 1 \in \mathrm{XS}$ (the statement 1.1.2.10). From this, from the statement $x^{\mathrm{len}(y)} \in \mathrm{FFOM}$ (the statement 1.1.2.9) and the statement 1.1.2.8 it follows that $h \in \mathrm{XS}$.

The theorem is proved. □

1.3. The Classes $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$, $\mathrm{BA}_f^{\#}$, and T- polynomiality

Statement 1.1.3.1. *The class* $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ *is closed with respect to bounded quantifications of the form* $(\exists x)_{x<p(\tilde{y})}$ *and* $(\forall x)_{x<p(\tilde{y})}$, *where* p *is a polynomial with coefficients from* $\mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. Let

$$\varphi(\tilde{y}) \equiv (\exists x)_{x<p(\tilde{y})}\psi(x,\tilde{y}),$$

$\psi \in \mathrm{BA}^{\#}$. Let $\rho(x,\tilde{y},z)$ is obtained from $\psi(x,\tilde{y})$ with the help of the counting operation with respect to the variable x and the polynomial $p(\tilde{y})$. Then $\rho(x,\tilde{y},z)$ is true if and only if z is a number of such $t < p(\tilde{y})$ that $\psi(t,\tilde{y})$ is true. From this it follows that $\rho(0,\tilde{y},0)$ is true if and only if there is no such $t < p(\tilde{y})$ that $\psi(t,\tilde{y})$ is true. For this it follows that for any $\tilde{y}$ it holds true that

$$\varphi(\tilde{y}) \equiv \neg\rho(0,\tilde{y},0).$$

Since $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ is closed with respect to the counting operation, the constant substitution operation and logical operations, one obtains that $\varphi \in \mathrm{BA}^{\#}$. The closeness of the class $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ with respect to $(\forall x)_{x<p(\tilde{y})}$ follows from the closeness of $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ with respect to $(\exists x)_{x<p(\tilde{y})}$ and logical operations. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.3.2. *The following inclusion takes place* $\mathrm{BA} \subseteq \mathrm{BA}^{\#}$.

Proof. Indeed, for this one needs to prove that $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ is closed with respect to quantification of the type $(\exists x)_{x<y}$ and $(\forall x)_{x<y}$, and this follows from the statement 1.1.3.1. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.3.3. *The class* $\mathrm{BA}_f^{\#}$ *is closed with respect to superposition.*

Proof. Closeness with respect to permutation, identification of variables and introduction of dummy variables follows from the fact that $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ is closed with respect to explicit transformations.

One can prove this closeness with respect to substitution of a function into function. Let

$$h(\tilde{x}) = f(g_1(\tilde{x}),\ldots,g_m(\tilde{x})),$$

$f, g_1, \ldots, g_m \in \mathrm{BA}_f^{\#}$. One can claim that $h \in \mathrm{BA}_f^{\#}$. Polynomial boundedness of the function h follows from the polynomial boundedness of

$f, g_1, \ldots, g_m$. Let $p(\tilde{x})$ be a polynomial that strictly upper-bounds functions $g_1(\tilde{x}), \ldots, g_m(\tilde{x})$. Then

$$(z = h(\tilde{x})) \equiv (\exists y_1)_{y_1 < p(\tilde{x})} \ldots (\exists y_m)_{y_m < p(\tilde{x})}$$
$$((y_1 = g_1(\tilde{x}))\& \ldots \&(y_m = g_m(\tilde{x}))\&(z = f(y_1, \ldots, y_m))).$$

From this, from the closeness of $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ with respect to logical operations and explicit transformations and from the statement 1.1.3.1 it follows that $(z = h(\tilde{x})) \in \mathrm{BA}^{\#}$. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.3.4. *The class* $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}_f$ *is closed with respect to the operation of narrowed bounded summation.*

Proof. Let

$$f(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n) = \sum_{y<x} \mathrm{sg}(g(y, z_1, \ldots, z_n)),$$

$g \in \mathrm{BA}^{\#}_f$. One can prove that $f \in \mathrm{BA}^{\#}_f$. Let

$$\rho(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n) \equiv \neg(0 = g(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n)).$$

It is obvious that ρ is obtained from the graph of g with the help of logical operations and substitution of constants, thus $\rho \in \mathrm{BA}^{\#}$. Let $\varphi(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n, u)$ is obtained from $\rho(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ with the help of counting operations with respect to the variable x and the polynomial x. Then $\varphi(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n, u)$ holds treu if and only if u is the number of $y < x$ such that $\rho(y, z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ is true (i.e. $\mathrm{sg}(g(y, z_1, \ldots, z_n)) = 1$). Thereby, for any $x, z_1, \ldots, z_n, u$ it is true that

$$(u = f(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n)) \equiv \varphi(x, z_1, \ldots, z_n, u).$$

From $\rho \in \mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ and the closeness of $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ with respect to explicit transformations and counting operations it follows that $\varphi \in \mathrm{BA}^{\#}$, i.e. the graph of the function f is in $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$. The polynomial boundedness of f obviously follows from the polynomial boundedness of g. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.3.5. *Functions* $0,\ x+1,\ x \div y,\ xy$ *are in* $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}_f$.

Proof. It is known that [10] the predicates

$$x = 0, \quad y = x + 1, \quad z = x \div y, \quad z = xy$$

are in BA. From this and the statement 1.1.3.2 it follows the following statement. □

Statement 1.1.3.6. *It satisfies* $\mathrm{S}_* \subseteq \mathrm{BA}^{\#}$.

Proof. From [10] it is known that S coincides with the minimal class of functions that contains functions $0,\ x+1,\ x \div y,\ xy$ and closed with respect to the superposition and the narrowed bounded summation. From this and the statements 1.1.3.5, 1.1.3.3, 1.1.3.4 it follows that

$$\mathrm{S} \subseteq \mathrm{BA}_f^{\#}.$$

From [10] is known that S_* is the set of all graphs of functions from S. Thereby,

$$\mathrm{S}_* \subseteq \mathrm{BA}^{\#}.$$

The statement is proved. □

It is easy to see that the following five statements hold true.

Statement 1.1.3.7. *If the function f is T-polynomial with respect to some set of variables, then $f \in [T]_{2^x}$.*

Statement 1.1.3.8. *If the function f is T-polynomial with respect to the set of variables X and $Y \subseteq X$, then f is T-polynomial with respect to variables Y.*

Statement 1.1.3.9. *If the function $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is T-polynomial with respect to the set of variables $\{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}\}$, the function $g(y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ is T-polynomial with respect to the set of variables $\{y_{j_1}, \ldots, y_{j_p}\}$, then*

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_{i_1-1}, g(y_1, \ldots, y_m), x_{i_1+1}, \ldots, x_n)$$

is T-polynomial with respect to the set of variables $\{x_{i_2}, \ldots, x_{i_k}, y_{j_1}, \ldots, y_{j_p}\}$.

Statement 1.1.3.10. *Let the function $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be T-polynomial with respect to the set of variables $\{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}\}$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, $i \notin \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$ and $g(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \in [T]$. Then*

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, g(y_1, \ldots, y_m), x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n)$$

is T-polynomial with respect to the set $\{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}\}$.

Statement 1.1.3.11. *Let the function* $g(y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ T *be a* T*-polynomial one with respect to the set of variables* $\{y_{j_1}, \ldots, y_{j_n}\}$,

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = g(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_m}).$$

Then $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to the set of all variables* x_i, *for which the set of all* y_j *such that* $i_j = i$, *is in* $\{y_{j_1}, \ldots, y_{j_n}\}$.

Statement 1.1.3.12. *Let* $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ *be* T*-polynomial with respect to the set of variables* X, $g(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ *differs from* f *in finite number of points. Then* $g(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to* X.

Proof. It is obvious that one can just prove this statement for one point. Let

$$f(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = b,\ g(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = c,$$

in other points f and g coincide. Then if $b < c$, then

$$g(x_1, \ldots, x_n) =$$

$$= f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) + (c - b) \cdot (1 \div ((x_1 \div a_1) + (a_1 \div x_1))) \cdot \ldots \cdot (1 \div ((x_n \div a_n) + (a_n \div x_n))).$$

An analogous formula holds true for $b > c$. From these formulas and from statements 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.10, 1.1.3.11 it follows that $g(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is T-polynomial with respect to X. □

1.4. The Inclusion $\mathrm{XS} \subseteq [T]_{2^x}$

Statement 1.1.4.1. *The function* $\mathrm{rm}(x, y)$ *is* T*-polynomial over the set of variables* $\{x, y\}$.

Proof. One has $\mathrm{rm}(x, y) = x \div [x/y] \cdot y$. Thus, $\mathrm{rm}(x, y) \in [T]$. From this it follows T-polynomiality of the function rm. □

Let

$$\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ l \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i 2^{il}.$$

One can notice that if the condition $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1} < 2^l$ is satisfied then for any i $(0 \leqslant i < n)$ the binary digits of the number $\langle x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ l \rangle$ from (il)-th up to $(il + l - 1)$-th make up the binary notation of the number x_i.

Let

$$\mathrm{rep}(x,n,l) = x \cdot \left[\frac{2^{nl} \div 1}{2^{l} \div 1}\right]^{1}.$$

Statement 1.1.4.2. *If* $n, l \geqslant 1$, *then*

$$\mathrm{rep}(x,n,l) = \langle \underbrace{x, x, \ldots, x}_{n \text{ times}};\ l\rangle.$$

Besides, $\mathrm{rep}(x,n,l)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to* $\{x\}$.

Proof. By using the formula for geometric progression sum, one obtains

$$\mathrm{rep}(x,n,l) = x \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 2^{li} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x 2^{li} = \langle \underbrace{x, x, \ldots, x}_{n \text{ times}};\ l\rangle.$$

T-polynomiality with respect to $\{x\}$ follows from the form of the formula (x is excluded from power exponents). The statement is proved. □

Let

$$\mathrm{incrx}(x,n,l_1,l_2) = \mathrm{rep}(x,n,l_2 \div l_1) \wedge \mathrm{rep}(2^{l_1} \div 1, n, l_2).$$

Statement 1.1.4.3. *If* $n, l_1 \geqslant 1$, $l_2 \geqslant (n+1)l_1$, $x = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ l_1\rangle$, $0 \leqslant x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1} < 2^{l_1}$, *then*

$$\mathrm{incrx}(x,n,l_1,l_2) = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ l_2\rangle.$$

Besides, $\mathrm{incrx}(x,n,l_1,l_2)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to* $\{x\}$.

Proof. One has

$$x = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i 2^{il_1} \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (2^{l_1} - 1) 2^{il_1} < 2^{nl_1}.$$

From $l_2 \geqslant (n+1)l_1$ it follows that

$$l_2 - l_1 \geqslant nl_1.$$

[1] In this dissertation, it was convenient to define functions through formulas rather than by conditions to which these formulas satisfy. Thus, for the reader it might be easier to read what follows the formula with statements on features of functions and the proofs of those statements rather than trying to parse the formula straight away.

From this it follows that the binary digits of the number $\mathrm{rep}(x, n, l_2 \div l_1)$ from $i(l_2 - l_1)$-th up to $(i(l_2 - l_1) + l_2 - l_1 - 1)$-th generate the binary notation of the number x $(0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1)$. Besides, binary digits of the number x from (il_1)-th up to $(il_1 + l_1 - 1)$-th make up binary notation of the number x_i $(0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1)$. From this it follows that the binary notation of the number $\mathrm{rep}(x, n, l_2 \div l_1)$ from (il_2)-th up to $(il_2 + l_1 - 1)$-th make up binary notation of the number x_i $(0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1)$.

One can note that the binary notation of the number $\mathrm{rep}(2^{l_1} \div 1, n, l_2)$ is n blocks of ones, besides i-th block $(0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1)$ takes up digits from (il_2)-th up to $(il_2 + l_1 - 1)$-th. Thereby, one obtains that

$$\mathrm{rep}(x, n, l_2 \div l_1) \wedge \mathrm{rep}(2^{l_1} \div 1, n, l_2) = \langle x_0, \ldots x_{n-1};\ l_2 \rangle.$$

T-polynomiality of $\mathrm{incrx}(x, n, l_1, l_2)$ with respect to $\{x\}$ follows from the form of the formula, from T- polynomiality of $\mathrm{rep}(x, n, l)$ with respect to $\{x\}$ and from statements 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.11. The statement is proved. $\square$

One can define families of functions p_n, a_n $(n \geqslant 1)$ in the following way:

$$\mathrm{p}_n(q, m_1, \ldots, m_n) = q^{2n} + q \cdot (m_1 + \ldots + m_n + 1),$$

$$\mathrm{a}_n(q, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n) = q \cdot \mathrm{p}_n(q, m_1, \ldots, m_n) \cdot (k_1 + \ldots + k_n + 1).$$

Further for brevity we will replace the expressions $\mathrm{p}_n(q, m_1, \ldots, m_n)$ and $\mathrm{a}_n(q, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n)$ with p and a respectively. One can define the family of functions swap_n $(n \geqslant 1)$ in the following way:

$$\mathrm{swap}_n(x, q, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n) =$$

$$= \mathrm{rm}\left(\left[\frac{\mathrm{incrx}(x, q^n, 1, \mathrm{p}) \cdot \prod_{r=1}^{n} \left[\frac{2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p} \div q(k_r\mathrm{p} \div m_r)}}{2^{k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{m_r}} \right]}{2^{n \cdot \mathrm{a}}} \right], 2^{\mathrm{p}} \right).$$

Statement 1.1.4.4. *Let $n, q \geqslant 1$, $f(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$ be some function that takes up values 0 and 1. Besides, let numbers $k_1, \ldots, k_n \geqslant 1$ be such that for any different vectors $(i'_1, \ldots, i'_n)$ and $(i''_1, \ldots, i''_n)$ $(0 \leqslant i'_1, \ldots, i'_n, i''_1, \ldots, i''_n < q)$ the following inequality holds*

$$k_1 i'_1 + \ldots + k_n i'_n \neq k_1 i''_1 + \ldots + k_n i''_n.$$

Then if

$$x = \sum_{0 \leqslant i_1, \ldots, i_n < q} f(i_1, \ldots, i_n) 2^{k_1 i_1 + \ldots + k_n i_n}, \tag{1.1}$$

then for any $m_1, \ldots, m_n$ *it is true that*

$$\mathrm{swap}_n(x, q, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n) = \sum_{0 \leqslant i_1, \ldots, i_n < q} f(i_1, \ldots, i_n) 2^{m_1 i_1 + \ldots + m_n i_n}.$$

Besides, $\mathrm{swap}_n(x, q, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to* $\{x\}$.

Proof. From the definition of p and from the fact that $k_r, q \geqslant 1$, it follows that for any r $(1 \leqslant r \leqslant n)$ it holds true that $k_r \mathrm{p} \geqslant m_r$. Besides, from the definition of a it follows that for any r $(1 \leqslant r \leqslant n)$ it is true that $\mathrm{a} \geqslant q k_r \mathrm{p}$. From these two inequalities it follows that

$$\left[\frac{2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p} \div q(k_r\mathrm{p} \div m_r)}}{2^{k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{m_r}} \right] = \left[\frac{2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p}} - 2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p}-q(k_r\mathrm{p}-m_r)}}{2^{k_r\mathrm{p}} - 2^{m_r}} \right]$$

By using the formula for the sum of a geometric sequence, one obtains

$$\left[\frac{2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p} \div q(k_r\mathrm{p} \div m_r)}}{2^{k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{m_r}} \right] = \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} 2^{\mathrm{a}+j(m_r-k_r\mathrm{p})}.$$

Thereby, one has

$$\prod_{r=1}^{n} \left[\frac{2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p} \div q(k_r\mathrm{p} \div m_r)}}{2^{k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{m_r}} \right] = \prod_{r=1}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} 2^{\mathrm{a}+j(m_r-k_r\mathrm{p})} =$$

$$= \sum_{0 \leqslant j_1, \ldots, j_n < q} 2^{n\mathrm{a}+j_1(m_1-k_1\mathrm{p})+\ldots+j_n(m_n-k_n\mathrm{p})}.$$

From the definition of p and from $q \geqslant 1$, it follows that $\mathrm{p} \geqslant q^n + 1$. From this and from the fact that f only takes up values from $\{0, 1\}$, and from (1.1) and the statement 1.1.4.3 it follows that

$$\mathrm{incrx}(x, q^n, 1, \mathrm{p}) = \sum_{0 \leqslant i_1, \ldots, i_n < q} f(i_1, \ldots, i_n) 2^{\mathrm{p} \cdot (k_1 i_1 + \ldots + k_n i_n)}.$$

Thereby,

$$\mathrm{incrx}(x, q^n, 1, \mathrm{p}) \cdot \prod_{r=1}^{n} \left[\frac{2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{\mathrm{a}+k_r\mathrm{p} \div q(k_r\mathrm{p} \div m_r)}}{2^{k_r\mathrm{p}} \div 2^{m_r}} \right] =$$

$$= \left(\sum_{0 \leqslant i_1, \ldots, i_n < q} f(i_1, \ldots, i_n) 2^{\mathrm{p} \cdot (k_1 i_1 + \ldots + k_n i_n)} \right) \cdot$$

$$\cdot \left(\sum_{0 \leqslant j_1, \ldots, j_n < q} 2^{n\mathrm{a} + j_1(m_1 - k_1\mathrm{p}) + \ldots + j_n(m_n - k_n\mathrm{p})} \right) =$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{0 \leqslant i_1, \ldots, i_n < q \\ 0 \leqslant j_1, \ldots, j_n < q}} f(i_1, \ldots, i_n) 2^{n\mathrm{a} + j_1 m_1 + \ldots + j_n m_n + \mathrm{p} \cdot (k_1(i_1 - j_1) + \ldots + k_n(i_n - j_n))}.$$

Let one divide all parts of this sum into three groups.

1. The terms for which $k_1(i_1 - j_1) + \ldots + k_n(i_n - j_n) \leqslant -1$. The sum of these terms one defines as A. It is clear that for such terms the following inequalities hold true

   $$n\mathrm{a} + j_1 m_1 + \ldots + j_n m_n + \mathrm{p} \cdot (k_1(i_1 - j_1) + \ldots + k_n(i_n - j_n)) \leqslant$$

   $$\leqslant n\mathrm{a} + q \cdot (m_1 + \ldots + m_n) - \mathrm{p} \leqslant n\mathrm{a} - q^{2n}.$$

   The last inequality follows from the definition of p. From these inequalities it follows that every term of this type is not bigger then $2^{n\mathrm{a} - q^{2n}}$. From this and from the fact that the total number of terms equals q^{2n}, one can conclude that

   $$A < 2^{n\mathrm{a}}.$$

2. The terms for which $k_1(i_1 - j_1) + \ldots + k_n(i_n - j_n) \geqslant 1$. Let the sum of these terms equal to B. It is plain that for such terms

   $$n\mathrm{a} + j_1 m_1 + \ldots + j_n m_n + \mathrm{p} \cdot (k_1(i_1 - j_1) + \ldots + k_n(i_n - j_n)) \geqslant n\mathrm{a} + \mathrm{p}.$$

   Thus, each of such terms is divided by $2^{n\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{p}}$. Thereby, one has

   $$B = 2^{n\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{p}} B_0,$$

   where $B_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

3. The terms for which $k_1(i_1 - j_1) + \ldots + k_n(i_n - j_n) = 0$, i.e.

$$k_1 i_1 + \ldots + k_n i_n = k_1 j_1 + \ldots + k_n j_n.$$

Let the sum of these terms equal C. As required, in this case $i_r = j_r$ for any $r = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Since for every vector $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ there exists only one vector $(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$, for which this condition is satisfied, it holds that

$$C = \sum_{0 \leqslant j_1, \ldots, j_n < q} f(j_1, \ldots, j_n) 2^{n\mathrm{a} + j_1 m_1 + \ldots + j_n m_n} = 2^{n\mathrm{a}} \cdot C_0,$$

where

$$C_0 = \sum_{0 \leqslant j_1, \ldots, j_n < q} f(j_1, \ldots, j_n) 2^{j_1 m_1 + \ldots + j_n m_n}.$$

The number of terms in a sum is q^n, each of which is no bigger than $2^{q \cdot (m_1 + \ldots + m_n)}$. From this and from the definition of p it follows that

$$C_0 \leqslant q^n \cdot 2^{q \cdot (m_1 + \ldots + m_n)} < 2^{q^{2n}} \cdot 2^{q \cdot (m_1 + \ldots + m_n)} \leqslant 2^{\mathrm{p}}.$$

Thereby, one has

$$\mathrm{swap}_n(x, q, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n) = \mathrm{rm}\left(\left[\frac{A + 2^{n\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{p}} B_0 + 2^{n\mathrm{a}} C_0}{2^{n\mathrm{a}}}\right], 2^{\mathrm{p}}\right) = C_0.$$

The last equality follows from the fact that $A < 2^{n\mathrm{a}}$ and $C_0 < 2^{\mathrm{p}}$. T- polynomiality of $\mathrm{swap}_n(x, q, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n)$ with respect to $\{x\}$ follows from the make up of the formula and the statements 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.11, 1.1.4.3, 1.1.4.1. □

Let

$$\mathrm{incr}(x, q, l) = \mathrm{swap}_1(x, q, 1, l),$$
$$\mathrm{decr}(x, q, l) = \mathrm{swap}_1(x, q, l, 1).$$

Statement 1.1.4.5. *Let* $q, l \geqslant 1$, $0 \leqslant x_0, \ldots, x_{q-1} \leqslant 1$,

$$x = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{q-1};\ 1 \rangle.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{incr}(x, q, l) = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{q-1};\ l \rangle.$$

Besides, $\mathrm{incr}(x, q, l)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to the variable* x.

Proof. Let $k_1 = 1,\ m_1 = l,\ n = 1,\ f(i) = x_i,$ if $i < q,\ f(i) = 0$ otherwise. Then for the numbers q, n, k_1, m_1, x and the function f all conditions of the statement 1.1.4.4 are satisfied. Thus,

$$\mathrm{swap}_1(x, q, 1, l) = \sum_{i=0}^{q-1} 2^{lx_i} = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ l\rangle.$$

T-polynomiality with respect to $\{x\}$ follows from the statememts 1.1.4.5 and 1.1.3.9. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.4.6. *Let* $q, l \geqslant 1,\ 0 \leqslant x_0, \ldots, x_{q-1} \leqslant 1,$

$$x = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{q-1};\ l\rangle.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{decr}(x, q, l) = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{q-1};\ 1\rangle.$$

Besides, $\mathrm{decr}(x, q, l)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to the set of variables* $\{x\}$.

The proof is completely analogous to the proof of the statement 1.1.4.5. Let

$$\mathrm{not}(x, n) = (2^n \div 1) \div x,$$

$$\mathrm{or}(x, y, n) = \mathrm{not}(\mathrm{not}(x, n) \wedge \mathrm{not}(y, n), n),$$

$$\mathrm{xor}(x, y, n) = \mathrm{or}(x, y, n) \wedge \mathrm{not}(x \wedge y, n).$$

Statement 1.1.4.7. *Let* $n \geqslant 1,$

$$x = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ 1\rangle,\ y = \langle y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1};\ 1\rangle,$$

$$0 \leqslant x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}, y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1} \leqslant 1.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{not}(x, n) = \langle 1 - x_0, \ldots, 1 - x_{n-1};\ 1\rangle,$$

$$\mathrm{or}(x, y, n) = \langle x_0 + y_0 - x_0y_0, \ldots, x_{n-1} + y_{n-1} - x_{n-1}y_{n-1};\ 1\rangle,$$

$$\mathrm{xor}(x, y, n) = \langle \mathrm{rm}(x_0 + y_0, 2), \ldots, \mathrm{rm}(x_{n-1} + y_{n-1}, 2);\ n\rangle.$$

Besides, $\mathrm{not}(x, n)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to* $\{x\}$, $\mathrm{or}(x, y, n)$ *and* $\mathrm{xor}(x, y, n)$ *are* T*-polynomial with respect to* $\{x, y\}$.

Proof. One has

$$\mathrm{not}(x,n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 2^i \div \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i 2^i = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (1-x_i)2^i = \langle 1-x_0, \ldots, 1-x_{n-1};\ 1\rangle.$$

The statements for or and xor follows from the fact that the corresponding equalities of the algebraic logic:

$$\alpha \vee \beta = \neg(\neg\alpha \wedge \neg\beta),$$

$$\alpha \oplus \beta = (\alpha \vee \beta) \wedge \neg(\alpha \wedge \beta).$$

T-polynomiality follows from the definition and statements 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.10, 1.1.3.11. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.4.8. *The set of all correct predicates is closed with respect to operations of propositional logic.*

Proof. Let $\rho(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$, $\varphi(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ be correct predicates and f_ρ, f_φ be their generating functions

$$\psi_1(x_1,\ldots,x_n) \equiv \neg\rho(x_1,\ldots,x_n),$$

$$\psi_2(x_1,\ldots,x_n) \equiv \rho(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\&\varphi(x_1,\ldots,x_n),$$

f_{ψ_1}, f_{ψ_2} are generating functions of the predicates ψ_1, ψ_2 respectively. From the statement 1.1.4.7 and the definition of generating function, it follows that for any $x \geqslant 1$ it satisfies

$$f_{\psi_1}(x) = \mathrm{not}(f_\rho(x), x^n), \qquad f_{\psi_2}(x) = f_\rho(x) \wedge f_\varphi(x).$$

From this and the statements 1.1.4.7, 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.12 it follows that

$$f_{\psi_1}, f_{\psi_2} \in [T]_{2^x}.$$

The statement is proved. □

Let

$$\mathrm{cmp}(x,y,n,l) =$$

$$= \mathrm{decr}\left(\left[\frac{((\mathrm{rep}(2^{2l\div 1},n,2l) + \mathrm{incr}(x,nl,2)) \div \mathrm{incr}(y,nl,2)) \wedge \mathrm{rep}(2^{2l\div 1},n,2l)}{2^{2l\div 1}}\right], n, 2l\right).$$

Statement 1.1.4.9. *Let* $n, l \geqslant 1$,

$$x = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ l\rangle,\ y = \langle y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1};\ l\rangle,$$

$$0 \leqslant x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}, y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1} < 2^l.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{cmp}(x, y, n, l) = \langle \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{n-1};\ 1\rangle,$$

where

$$\sigma_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x_i \geqslant y_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Besides, $\mathrm{cmp}(x, y, n, l)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to* $\{x, y\}$.

Proof. Let $x_{i,j}$ signify j-th binary digit of the number x_i, $y_{i,j}$ is j-th digit of y_i. Then for any i $(0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1)$ it satisfies

$$x_i = \langle x_{i,0}, \ldots, x_{i,l-1};\ 1\rangle, \quad y_i = \langle y_{i,0}, \ldots, y_{i,l-1};\ 1\rangle.$$

Besides,

$$x = \langle x_{0,0}, \ldots, x_{0,l-1}, x_{1,0}, \ldots, x_{1,l-1}, \ldots, x_{n,0}, \ldots, x_{n,l-1};\ 1\rangle,$$

$$y = \langle y_{0,0}, \ldots, y_{0,l-1}, y_{1,0}, \ldots, y_{1,l-1}, \ldots, y_{n,0}, \ldots, y_{n,l-1};\ 1\rangle.$$

From the statement 1.1.4.5 and simple properties of numbers it follows that

$$\mathrm{incr}(x, nl, 2) = \langle x'_0, \ldots, x'_{n-1};\ 2l\rangle, \quad \mathrm{incr}(y, nl, 2) = \langle y'_0, \ldots, y'_{n-1};\ 2l\rangle,$$

where for all i $(0 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1)$

$$x'_i = \langle x_{i,0}, \ldots, x_{i,l-1};\ 2\rangle, \quad y'_i = \langle y_{i,0}, \ldots, y_{i,l-1};\ 2\rangle.$$

From this and the statement 1.1.4.2 it follows that

$$(\mathrm{rep}(2^{2l \div 1}, n, 2l) + \mathrm{incr}(x, nl, 2)) \div \mathrm{incr}(y, nl, 2) =$$

$$= \langle 2^{2l-1} + x'_0 - y'_0, \ldots, 2^{2l-1} + x'_{n-1} - y'_{n-1};\ 2l\rangle.$$

One can notice that for any i $(0 \leqslant i < n)$ it holds that

$$0 \leqslant 2^{2l-1} + x'_i - y'_i < 2^{2l}.$$

From this, the statement 1.1.4.2, and simple properties of binary number notation it follows that

$$((\mathrm{rep}(2^{2l\div 1}, n, 2l) + \mathrm{incr}(x, nl, 2)) \div \mathrm{incr}(y, nl, 2)) \wedge \mathrm{rep}(2^{2l\div 1}, n, 2l) =$$

$$\langle (2^{2l-1} + x'_0 \div y'_0) \wedge 2^{2l-1}, \ldots, (2^{2l-1} + x'_{n-1} \div y'_{n-1}) \wedge 2^{2l-1};\ 2l\rangle.$$

It is obvious that for any i $(0 \leqslant i < n)$

$$(2^{2l-1} + x'_i - y'_i) \wedge 2^{2l-1} = \begin{cases} 2^{2l-1}, \text{ if } x'_i \geqslant y'_i, \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Besides, for any i $(0 \leqslant i < n)$ it is true that

$$(x_i \geqslant y_i) \Leftrightarrow (x'_i \geqslant y'_i).$$

Thereby,

$$((\mathrm{rep}(2^{2l\div 1}, n, 2l) + \mathrm{incr}(x, nl, 2)) \div \mathrm{incr}(y, nl, 2)) \wedge \mathrm{rep}(2^{2l\div 1}, n, 2l) =$$

$$\langle \sigma_0 2^{2l-1}, \ldots, \sigma_{n-1} 2^{2l-1};\ 2l\rangle.$$

From this and from the statement 1.1.4.6 it follows that

$$\mathrm{cmp}(x, y, n, l) = \langle \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{n-1};\ 1\rangle.$$

T- polynomiality follows from 1.1.4.5, 1.1.4.6, 1.1.4.2, 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.11. □

Let

$$\mathrm{cmpeq}(x, y, n, l) = \mathrm{cmp}(x, y, n, l) \wedge \mathrm{cmp}(y, x, n, l).$$

Statement 1.1.4.10. *Let* $n, l \geqslant 1$,

$$x = \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ l\rangle, \quad y = \langle y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1};\ l\rangle,$$

$$0 \leqslant x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}, y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1} < 2^l.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{cmpeq}(x, y, n, l) = \langle \sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{n-1};\ 1\rangle,$$

where

$$\sigma_i = \begin{cases} 1, \ \textit{if } x_i = y_i, \\ 0 \ \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Besides, $\mathrm{cmpeq}(x, y, n, l)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to* $\{x, y\}$.

Proof. From the statement 1.1.4.9 it follows that

$$\mathrm{cmp}(x,y,n,l)=\langle\sigma'_0,\ldots,\sigma'_{n-1};\ 1\rangle,\quad \mathrm{cmp}(y,x,n,l)=\langle\sigma''_0,\ldots,\sigma''_{n-1};\ 1\rangle,$$

where

$$\sigma'_i=\begin{cases}1,\ \text{if } x_i\geqslant y_i,\\ 0\ \text{otherwise},\end{cases}\qquad \sigma''_i=\begin{cases}1,\ \text{if } x_i\leqslant y_i,\\ 0\ \text{otherwise}.\end{cases}$$

From here it follows the first part of the statement that is being proved. The second part follows from the statement 1.1.4.9. □

Statement 1.1.4.11. *For any $n\geqslant 0$ the function $g_n(y,z)$, which is defined by the following relation*

$$g_n(y,z)=\sum_{x<y}2^{xz}x^n,$$

belongs to $[T]_{2^x}$.

Proof. This statement follows from known formulas for summation. □

Consequence. *If $r(z_1,\ldots,z_n)$ is a polynomial with natural coefficients, then*

$$\sum_{0\leqslant z_1,\ldots,z_n<x} r(z_1,\ldots,z_n)2^{y(z_1+z_2x+\ldots+z_nx^{n-1})}\in[T]_{2^x}.$$

Proof. Indeed, it is obvious that one needs to consider the case where r is a monomial,

$$r(z_1,\ldots,z_n)=C\cdot z_1^{m_1}\ldots z_n^{m_n}.$$

Then

$$\sum_{0\leqslant z_1,\ldots,z_n<x} r(z_1,\ldots,z_n)2^{y(z_1+z_2x+\ldots+z_nx^{n-1})}=$$

$$=\sum_{0\leqslant z_1,\ldots,z_n<x} C\cdot z_1^{m_1}\ldots z_n^{m_n}2^{y(z_1+z_2x+\ldots+z_nx^{n-1})}=$$

$$=C\cdot\left(\sum_{0\leqslant z<x}z^{m_1}2^{zy}\right)\cdot\left(\sum_{0\leqslant z<x}z^{m_2}2^{zyx}\right)\cdot\ldots\cdot\left(\sum_{0\leqslant z<x}z^{m_n}2^{zyx^{n-1}}\right).$$

Thus, from the statement 1.1.4.11 it follows the claim that one was proving. □

Statement 1.1.4.12. *Let* $p(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ *and* $q(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ *be polynomials with coefficients from* $\mathbb{N}_0$. *Then the predicate*

$$\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \equiv (p(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \geqslant q(x_1, \ldots, x_n))$$

is the correct one.

Proof. For any function $r(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ one denotes

$$g_r(x, y) = \sum_{0 \leqslant z_1, \ldots, z_n < x} r(z_1, \ldots, z_n) 2^{y(z_1 + z_2 x + \ldots + z_n x^{n-1})}.$$

From the consequence from the statement 1.1.4.11 it follows that $g_p(x, y) \in [T]_{2^x}$ and $g_q(x, y) \in [T]_{2^x}$.

Let

$$f(x) = \mathrm{cmp}(g_p(x, p+q+1), g_q(x, p+q+1), x^n, p+q+1),$$

where p, q are contracted notations for $p(\underbrace{x, \ldots, x}_{n \text{ times}})$ and $q(\underbrace{x, \ldots, x}_{n \text{ times}})$ respectively. One can prove that for any $x \geqslant 1$ it is true that

$$f(x) = f_\varphi(x),$$

where f_φ is the generating function of the predicate φ. Indeed, let $x \geqslant 1$. One can notice that

$$g_p(x, p+q+1) = \langle p(0, \ldots, 0), p(1, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, p(x-1, \ldots, x-1);\ p+q+1 \rangle,$$

$$g_q(x, p+q+1) = \langle q(0, \ldots, 0), q(1, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, q(x-1, \ldots, x-1);\ p+q+1 \rangle$$

(vectors are ordered in reverse lexicographical order). It is obvious that for any $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ such that $0 \leqslant z_1, \ldots, z_n < x$, it holds true

$$p(z_1, \ldots, z_n), q(z_1, \ldots, z_n) < 2^{p+q+1}.$$

From this and from the stastement 1.1.4.9 one can conclude that

$$f(x) = \langle \sigma(0, \ldots, 0), \sigma(1, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, \sigma(x-1, \ldots, x-1);\ 1 \rangle,$$

where

$$\sigma(z_1, \ldots, z_n) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } p(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \geqslant q(z_1, \ldots, z_n), \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thereby, for $x \geqslant 1$ $f(x) = f_\varphi(x)$. From statements 1.1.4.9, 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.12 it follows that $f_\varphi(x) \in [T]_{2^x}$. Thereby, φ is a correct predicate. The statement is proved. □

Consequence. *For polynomials p and q the predicates $p = q$, $p \neq q$, $p > q$ are correct.*

Proof. Indeed, it follows from the statement 1.1.4.8 and relations

$$(p = q) \equiv (p \geqslant q)\&(q \geqslant p), \quad (p \neq q) \equiv \neg(p = q),$$

$$(p > q) \equiv (p \geqslant q)\&\neg(q \geqslant p).$$

□

Statement 1.1.4.13. *The set of all correct predicates is closed with respect to explicit transformations.*

Proof. It is obvious that to prove the statements one needs to establish the fact that the set of all correct predicates is closed with respect to variables permutation, substituting constants instead of last variable, identification of last two variables, introduction of the dummy variable at the last place.

1. *Permutation of variables.* let

$$\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \psi(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_n}),$$

where $(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$ is some permutation of numbers $1, 2, \ldots, n$, $f_\varphi(y), f_\psi(y)$ are the generating functions of predicates φ and ψ respectively, the predicate ψ is a correct one. Then

$$f_\psi(y) = \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n < y} \chi_\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) 2^{x_1 + x_2 y + \ldots + x_n y^{n-1}} =$$

$$= \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n < y} \chi_\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) 2^{k_1 x_1 + \ldots + k_n x_n},$$

$$f_\varphi(y) = \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n < y} \chi_\psi(x_{i_1}, \ldots, z_{i_n}) 2^{x_1 + x_2 y + \ldots + x_n y^{n-1}} =$$

$$= \sum_{0 \leqslant z_1, \ldots, z_n < y} \chi_\psi(z_1, \ldots, z_n) 2^{m_1 z_1 + \ldots + m_n z_n},$$

where

$$k_i = y^{i-1},\ m_i = y^{j_i-1},\ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n,$$

$(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ is the inverse permutation to $(i_1, \ldots, i_n)$, χ_φ, χ_ψ are the characteristic functions of the predicates φ and ψ respectively. It is easy to see that for numbers $y, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n$ the conditions of the statement 1.1.4.4 are satisfied. From this it follows that

$$f_\varphi(y) = \mathrm{swap}_n(f_\psi(y), y, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n) =$$

$$= \mathrm{swap}_n(f_\psi(y), y, 1, y, \ldots, y^{n-1}, y^{j_1-1}, \ldots, y^{j_n-1}).$$

From this, from the statements 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.11, 1.1.4.4, and from $f_\psi \in [T]_{2^x}$ it follows that $f_\varphi \in [T]$. Thereby, the predicate φ is correct.

2. *Substituing of a constant in the place of the last variable.* Let

$$\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n, a),$$

where ψ is a correct predicate, $a \in N$ is a constant. Let one assume that

$$\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \equiv \psi(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \& (x_{n+1} = a).$$

From the statement 1.1.4.8, the consequenc from the statement 1.1.4.12, and from the fact that ψ is correct, it follows that ρ is also correct. Let χ_φ, χ_ψ, χ_ρ be the characteristic functions of the predicates φ, ψ, ρ respectively, f_φ, f_ψ, f_ρ are their generating functions. Then for $y > a$ one has

$$f_\rho(y) = \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1} < y} \chi_\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) 2^{x_1 + x_2 y + \ldots, x_{n+1} y^n} =$$

$$\sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n < y} \chi_\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n, a) 2^{x_1 + x_2 y + \ldots, x_n y^{n-1} + a y^n} =$$

$$= 2^{a y^n} \cdot \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n < y} \chi_\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) 2^{x_1 + x_2 y + \ldots, x_n y^{n-1}} = 2^{a y^n} \cdot f_\varphi(y).$$

Thereby, for any $y > a$ it satisfies

$$f_\varphi(y) = \left[\frac{f_\rho(y)}{2^{a y^n}} \right].$$

From here, from $f_\rho \in [T]_{2^x}$, and from statements 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.12 it follows that $f_\varphi \in [T]_{2^x}$. Therefore, the predicate φ is correct.

3. *Identification of the last two variables.* Let

$$\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_n),$$

where ψ is a correct predicate. Let one contend that

$$\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \equiv \psi(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \& (x_n = x_{n+1}).$$

From the statement 1.1.4.8, consequence of the statement 1.1.4.12 and from the fact that ψ is correct, it follows that ρ is also correct. Let χ_φ, χ_ρ be characteristic functions of predicates φ, ρ respectively, f_φ, f_ρ are their generating functions. Then one has

$$f_\rho(y) = \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1} < y} \chi_\rho(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) 2^{x_1 + x_2 y + \ldots, x_{n+1} y^n}$$

$$= \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n < y} \chi_\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) 2^{x_1 + x_2 y + \ldots + x_{n-1} y^{n-2} + x_n (y^{n-1} + y^n)}$$

$$= \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n < y} \chi_\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) 2^{k_1 x_1 + \ldots + k_n x_n},$$

where

$$k_i = y^{i-1},\ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1, \quad k_n = y^{n-1} + y^n.$$

On the other hand,

$$f_\varphi(y) = \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n < y} \chi_\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) 2^{m_1 x_1 + \ldots + m_n x_n},$$

where

$$m_i = y^{i-1},\ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n.$$

It is easy to check that for numbers $y, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n$ the conditions of the statement 1.1.4.4 are satisfied. Thereby, one obtains

$$f_\varphi(y) = \mathrm{swap}_n(f_\rho(y), y, k_1, \ldots, k_n, m_1, \ldots, m_n) =$$

$$= \mathrm{swap}_n(f_\rho(y), y, 1, y, \ldots, y^{n-2}, y^{n-1} + y^n, 1, y, \ldots, y^{n-1}).$$

From this and from the statements 1.1.4.4, 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.11 it follows that $f_\varphi \in [T]_{2^x}$. Thereby, the predicate φ is correct.

4. *Introduction of a dummy variable in place of the last variable.* Let

$$\varphi(x_1,\dots,x_n,x_{n+1}) = \psi(x_1,\dots,x_n),$$

ψ is a correct predicate, χ_φ, χ_ψ are the characteristic functions of the predicates φ, ψ respectively, f_φ, f_ψ are their generating functions. For $y \geqslant 1$ one has

$$f_\varphi(y) = \sum_{0\leqslant x_1,\dots,x_{n+1}<y} \chi_\psi(x_1,\dots,x_n) 2^{x_1+x_2y+\dots+x_{n+1}y^n}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{0\leqslant x_1,\dots,x_n<y} \chi_\psi(x_1,\dots,x_n) 2^{x_1+x_2y+\dots+x_ny^{n-1}}\right)\cdot\left(\sum_{0\leqslant x<y} 2^{xy^n}\right)$$

$$= f_\psi(y)\cdot\left[\frac{2^{y^{n+1}\div 1}}{2^{y^n}\div 1}\right].$$

From this and from statements 1.1.3.9 and 1.1.3.12 it follows that $f_\varphi \in [T]_{2^x}$, i.e. φ is a correct predicate.

The statement is proved. □

Let

$$\mathrm{sum}(x,n,l,k) = \left[\frac{(x\cdot\left[\frac{2^{kl}\div 1}{2^l\div 1}\right])\wedge \mathrm{rep}(\mathrm{rep}(1,l,1),n,kl)}{2^{(k\div 1)l}}\right].$$

Statement 1.1.4.14. *Let* $n,l,k \geqslant 1$, $k < 2^l$,

$$x = \langle x_{0,0}, x_{0,1},\dots,x_{0,k-1},\dots,x_{n-1,0},x_{n-1,1},\dots,x_{n-1,k-1};\ l\rangle,$$

where for all i,j $(0\leqslant i<n,\ 0\leqslant j<k)$ *it satisfies* $0\leqslant x_{i,j}\leqslant 1$. *Then*

$$\mathrm{sum}(x,n,l,k) = \langle s_0,\dots,s_{n-1};\ lk\rangle,$$

where

$$s_i = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} x_{i,j},\quad 0\leqslant i<n.$$

Besides, $\mathrm{sum}(x,n,l,k)$ *is* T*-polynomial with respect to* $\{x\}$.

Proof. Let one represent x in the following way:

$$x = \langle y_0, \ldots, y_{kn-1};\ l\rangle,$$

such that

$$0 \leqslant y_i \leqslant 1, \quad 0 \leqslant i < kn.$$

Then

$$x \cdot \left[\frac{2^{kl} \div 1}{2^l \div 1}\right] = \left(\sum_{0\leqslant i<kn} y_i 2^{il}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{0\leqslant j<k} 2^{jl}\right) = \sum_{\substack{0\leqslant i<kn\\ 0\leqslant j<k}} y_i 2^{(i+j)l}$$

$$= \sum_{p=0}^{k(n+1)-2} \sum_{\substack{0\leqslant i<kn\\ 0\leqslant p-i<k}} y_i 2^{pl} = \langle z_0, \ldots, z_{k(n+1)-2};\ l\rangle,$$

where

$$z_p = \sum_{\substack{0\leqslant i<kn\\ 0\leqslant p-i<k}} y_i \qquad (0 \leqslant p \leqslant k(n+1)-2).$$

One can note that the binary notation of the number $\mathrm{rep}(\mathrm{rep}(1, l, 1), n, kl)$ consists of n blocks with ones, such that r-th block occupies digits from $l(rk+k-1)$-th up to $(l(rk+k)-1)$-th $(0 \leqslant r < n)$. From this, from the fact that for any p $(0 \leqslant p \leqslant k(n+1)-2)$ it satisfies $z_p \leqslant k < 2^l$, and from the fact that for any i $(0 \leqslant i < n)$ it is true that $s_i = z_{ik+k-1}$, it follows that

$$\left(x \cdot \left[\frac{2^{kl} \div 1}{2^l \div 1}\right]\right) \wedge \mathrm{rep}(\mathrm{rep}(1, l, 1), n, kl)$$

$$= \langle \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{k-1 \text{ times}}, z_{k-1}, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{k-1 \text{ times}}, z_{2k-1}, \ldots, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{k-1 \text{ times}}, z_{nk-1};\ l\rangle$$

$$= \langle \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{k-1 \text{ times}}, s_0, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{k-1 \text{ times}}, s_1, \ldots, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{k-1 \text{ times}}, s_{n-1};\ l\rangle$$

$$= 2^{(k-1)l} \cdot \langle s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1};\ kl\rangle.$$

From this it follows that

$$\mathrm{sum}(x, n, l, k) = \langle s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1};\ kl\rangle.$$

T-polynomiality with respect to $\{x\}$ follows from the statements 1.1.4.2, 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.11. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.4.15. *The set of all correct predicates is closed with respect to the operation of counting.*

Proof. Due to statement 1.1.4.13 it is sufficient to prove the closeness in terms of counting with respect to the first variable. Let $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y)$ be obtained from $\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ by counting operation with respect to the variable x_1 and the polynomial $p(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, ψ be a correct polynomial. Let one introduce the predicate ρ in the following way:

$$\rho(x, x_1, \ldots, x_n, y) \equiv \psi(x, x_2, \ldots, x_n)\&(x < p(x_1, \ldots, x_n)).$$

From the correctness of ψ, statements 1.1.4.8, 1.1.4.13, and a consequence from the statement 1.1.4.12 it follows that ρ is a correct predicate. Let

$$q(z) = p(\underbrace{z, \ldots, z}_{n}) + z + 1.$$

One can assume that

$$f'_\rho(z) = \mathrm{incr}(f_\rho(q(z)), q(z)^{n+2}, q(z)).$$

Let $z \geqslant 1$. From statements 1.1.4.5, 1.1.3.9 it follows that $f'_\rho \in [T]_{2^x}$. Besides,

$$f_\rho(q(z)) = \langle \chi_\rho(0, \ldots, 0), \chi_\rho(1, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, \chi_\rho(q(z) - 1, \ldots, q(z) - 1);\ 1\rangle.$$

Thereby, from the statement 1.1.4.5 it follows that

$$f'_\rho(z) = \langle \chi_\rho(0, \ldots, 0), \chi_\rho(1, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, \chi_\rho(q(z) - 1, \ldots, q(z) - 1);\ q(z)\rangle.$$

One can assume that

$$u(z) = \mathrm{sum}(f'_\rho(z), q(z)^{n+1}, q(z), q(z)).$$

From the statement 1.1.4.14 it follows that

$$u(z) = \langle g(0, \ldots, 0, z), g(1, 0, \ldots, 0, z), \ldots, g(q(z) - 1, \ldots, q(z) - 1, z);\ q(z)^2\rangle, \tag{1.2}$$

where $g(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, z)$ is the number of $x < q(z)$ such that $\rho(x, x_1, \ldots, x_n, y)$ holds true. Besides, from the statements 1.1.4.14 and 1.1.3.9 it follows that $u \in [T]_{2^x}$. Let

$$v(z) = \langle h(0, \ldots, 0), h(1, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, h(q(z) - 1, \ldots, q(z) - 1);\ q(z)^2\rangle, \tag{1.3}$$

where $h(x_1,\dots,x_n,y)=y$ for any $x_1,\dots,x_n,y\in\mathbb{N}_0$. It is obvious that

$$v(z)=\left(\sum_{y=0}^{q(z)-1} y2^{yq(z)^{n-2}}\right)\cdot\left(\sum_{i=0}^{q(z)^n-1}2^{q(z)^2 i}\right).$$

From the statement 1.1.4.11 it follows that $v(z)\in[T]_{2^x}$. From (1.2), (1.3), and the statement 1.1.4.10 it follows that

$$\begin{gathered}\operatorname{cmpeq}(u(z),v(z),q(z)^{n+1},q(z)^2)=\\ =\langle\sigma(0,\dots,0,z),\sigma(1,\dots,0,z),\dots,\sigma(q(z)-1,\dots,q(z)-1,z);\ 1\rangle,\end{gathered}\tag{1.4}$$

where

$$\sigma(x_1,\dots,x_n,y,z)=\begin{cases}1,\text{if } y \text{ is the number of } x<q(z) \text{ such that}\\ \qquad\rho(x,x_1,\dots,x_n,y) \text{ holds true,}\\ 0 \text{ otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Let

$$w(z)=\sum_{0\leqslant i_1,\dots,i_{n+1}<z}2^{i_1+i_2q(z)+\dots+i_{n+1}q(z)^n}=\prod_{j=1}^{n+1}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{z-1}2^{iq(z)^{j-1}}\right).$$

From the statement 1.1.4.11 it follows that $w\in[T]$. From the fact that $q(z)>z$, it follows that

$$w(z)=\langle\xi(0,\dots,0,z),\xi(1,\dots,0,z),\dots,\xi(q(z)-1,\dots,q(z)-1,z);\ 1\rangle,$$

where for all $x_1,\dots,x_n,y,z\in\mathbb{N}_0$ it satisfies

$$\xi(x_1,\dots,x_n,y,z)=\begin{cases}1,\ \text{if } (x_1<z)\&\dots\&(x_n<z)\&(y<z) \text{ is true,}\\ 0 \text{ otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

From this and (1.4) it follows that

$$\begin{gathered}\operatorname{cmpeq}(u(z),v(z),q(z)^{n+1},q(z)^2)\wedge w(z)\\ =\langle\sigma'(0,\dots,0,z),\sigma'(1,\dots,0,z),\dots,\sigma'(q(z)-1,\dots,q(z)-1,z);\ 1\rangle,\end{gathered}$$

where

$$\sigma'(x_1,\dots,x_n,y,z)=\begin{cases}1,\text{if } (x_1<z)\&\dots\&(x_n<z)\&(y<z) \text{ is satisfied and}\\ \qquad y \text{ is the number } x<q(z) \text{ such that}\\ \qquad\rho(x,x_1,\dots,x_n,y) \text{ holds true,}\\ 0 \text{ otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

From this it follows that

$$\begin{gathered}\operatorname{cmpeq}(u(z), v(z), q(z)^{n+1}, q(z)^2) \wedge w(z) \\ = \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n, y < z} \sigma(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, z) 2^{x_1 + x_2 q(z) + \ldots + x_n q(z)^{n-1} + y q(z)^n}.\end{gathered}$$

From this, from the fact that $q(z) > z$, and from the statement 1.1.4.4 it follows that

$$\begin{gathered}\operatorname{swap}_{n+1}(\operatorname{cmpeq}(u(z), v(z), q(z)^{n+1}, q(z)^2) \wedge w(z), \\ z, 1, q(z), \ldots, q(z)^n, 1, z, \ldots, z^n) = \\ = \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n, y < z} \sigma(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, z) 2^{x_1 + x_2 z + \ldots + x_n z^{n-1} + y z^n} = \qquad (1.5) \\ = \langle \sigma(0, \ldots, 0, z), \sigma(1, \ldots, 0, z), \ldots, \sigma(z-1, \ldots, z-1, z);\ 1 \rangle.\end{gathered}$$

It is obvious that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n < z$ it holds true that $p(x_1, \ldots, x_n) < q(z)$. From this and from the definitions of σ and ρ it follows that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, z$ such that $x_1, \ldots, x_n < z$, it is true that

$$\sigma(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, z) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } y \text{ is the number } x < p(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \text{ such that} \\ \qquad \psi(x, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \text{ is true,} \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From this and (1.5) it follows that for any $z \geqslant 1$ it satisfies

$$\begin{gathered}f_\varphi(z) = \operatorname{swap}_{n+1}(\operatorname{cmpeq}(u(z), v(z), q(z)^{n+1}, q(z)^2) \wedge w(z), \\ z, 1, q(z), \ldots, q(z)^n, 1, z, \ldots, z^n).\end{gathered}$$

Thus, from inclusions $u(z), v(z), w(z) \in [T]$ and from statements 1.1.4.4, 1.1.4.10, 1.1.3.12, 1.1.3.9, 1.1.3.11 it follows that $f_\varphi \in [T]$. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.1.4.16. *Any predicate from* $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ *is correct.*

Proof. Indeed, according to the consequence from the statement 1.1.4.12 the predicates $x + y = z$ and $xy = z$ are correct. From here and from the statements 1.1.4.13, 1.1.4.8 and 1.1.4.15 it follows that any predicate from $\mathrm{BA}^{\#}$ is correct. The statement is proved. □

Theorem 8. *There is an inclusion*

$$\mathrm{XS} \subseteq [T]_{2^x}.$$

Proof. Let $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathrm{XS}$. Then

$$g(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y) = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\langle y \rangle \in \mathrm{S}.$$

From the statement 1.1.3.6 it follows that $g(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y)$ is the characteristic function of a predicate $\psi \in \mathrm{BA}^{\#}$. From the statement 1.1.4.16 it follows that ψ is the correct predicate. From the definition of the generating function it follows that

$$f_\psi(z) = \sum_{0 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, x_n, y < z} g(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y) 2^{x_1 + x_2 z + \ldots + x_n z^{n-1} + y z^n}.$$

Thereby, for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, z$ such that $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y < z$ and $z \geqslant 1$, y-th binary digit of the number $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ equals to the binary digit of the number $f_\psi(z)$ with the number $x_1 + x_2 z + \ldots + x_n z^{n-1} + y z^n$. If additionally the length of the binary notation of $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ does not exceed t, then from the statement 1.1.4.6 it follows that

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \mathrm{decr}\left(\left[\frac{f_\psi(z)}{2^{x_1 + x_2 z + \ldots + x_n z^{n-1}}}\right], tz^n, z^n\right).$$

By plugging in z the expression $x_1 + \ldots + x_n + 1$, and instead of t a polynomial $t(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ such that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ it holds that

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) < 2^{t(x_1, \ldots, x_n)},$$

one obtains an expression for f. From the correctness of the predicate ψ and from statements 1.1.4.6 and 1.1.3.9 it follows that $f \in [T]_{2^x}$. The statement is proved. □

1.5. Proof of Theorem 1

There is the following inclusion

$$[T]_{2^x} \subseteq [T]_{x^y}.$$

Besides, from the theorem 7 it follows that $[T]_{x^y} \subseteq \mathrm{XS}$, and from the theorem 8 it follows that $\mathrm{XS} \subseteq [T]_{2^x}$. Thereby,

$$[T]_{x^y} \subseteq \mathrm{XS} \subseteq [T]_{2^x} \subseteq [T]_{x^y}.$$

Thus

$$\mathrm{XS} = [T]_{2^x} = [T]_{x^y}.$$

The main theorem is proved.

2. Basis by Superposition of FFOM

2.1. Definitions

If α is the line of symbols, n is a number, then put

$$\mathrm{ext}(\alpha, n) = \alpha \underbrace{00\ldots0}_{n \div |\alpha|}.$$

If $x_1, \ldots, x_n, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $k \geqslant 1$, then let

$$\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \mathrm{ext}(\mathrm{CODE}(x_1, \ldots, x_n), 2|\mathrm{CODE}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|^k).$$

Besides, if additionally

$$y < 2^{|\mathrm{CODE}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)|^k},$$

then by $\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{alt}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n;\ y)$ one can denote the line $\alpha_1\beta_1\alpha_2\beta_2\ldots\alpha_l\beta_l$, where $\alpha_1\ldots\alpha_l = \mathrm{ext}(\mathrm{CODE}(x_1, \ldots, x_n), |\mathrm{CODE}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|^k)$, $\beta_l\ldots\beta_2\beta_1$ is the binary notation of y (as completed by zeroes from the left, if needs be, that is β_1 is the lowest order digit, β_2 follows it, etc.).

The class $\mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{alt}}$ can be defined as the set of everywhere defined over the set $\mathbb{N}_0$ functions $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ such that the following two conditions are satisfied

1. There exists a k such that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ it satisfies

$$\mathrm{len}(f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) \leqslant |\mathrm{CODE}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|^k. \tag{1.6}$$

2. For any $k \geqslant 1$ that satisfies the condition above there exists a predicate $\rho \in \mathrm{FOM}$ such that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y$ from $y < |\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|$ it follows that

$$\rho(\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{alt}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n;\ y)) \equiv (f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\langle y \rangle = 1).$$

Let $\mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{var}}$ be the set of all everywhere defined over the set $\mathbb{N}_0$ functions $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, for which the following two conditions are satisfied.

1. There exists a k such that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ it holds that (1.6).

2. For any $k \geqslant 1$ that satisfies the condition above there exists a FOM-formula Φ over the variables $z_1, \ldots, z_m, y$, with a corresponding predicate $\rho_\Phi(X, z_1, \ldots, z_m, y)$, where

$$X \in \{0,1\}^+, \quad 1 \leqslant x_1, \ldots, z_m, y \leqslant |X|,$$

such that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y, z_1, \ldots, z_m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ from

$$1 \leqslant z_1, \ldots, z_m, y \leqslant |\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|$$

it follows that

$$\rho_\Phi(\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n), z_1, \ldots, z_m, y) \equiv (f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\langle y - 1 \rangle = 1).$$

Let

$$T' = \{x + y, \quad x \div y, \quad x \wedge y, \quad [x/y], \quad 2^{[\log_2 x]^2}\}.$$

If Q is some class of functions, then by $Q^{\log}$ one can denote the set of all functions of the form $[\log_2 f]$, where $f \in Q$.

Definition. The function $h(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$, which is defined for $X \in \{0,1\}^+$, $1 \leqslant y_1, \ldots, y_n \leqslant |X|$ and takes values from $\mathbb{N}_0$, is called *h-function* if for any $X, y_1, \ldots, y_m$ from its domain it satisfies

$$h(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) < 2^{|X|}.$$

Definition. h-function $h(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ is called *correct* if there exists a function $f(x, z) \in [T']$ such that for any X, $y_1, \ldots, y_m$ from the domain of h it holds that

$$f(c(X), 2^{|X|}) = \sum_{1 \leqslant y_1, \ldots, y_m \leqslant |X|} (2^{(y_1-1)|X|+(y_2-1)|X|^2+\ldots+(y_m-1)|X|^m} h(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)),$$

where $c(X)$ is the number the binary notation of which (perhaps as completed by zeroes from the left) is X (for example if $X = 00101$, then $c(X) = 5$).

Definition. The predicate $\rho(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ that is defined for $X \in \{0,1\}^+$, $1 \leqslant y_1, \ldots, y_m \leqslant |X|$ is called *correct*[2], if its characteristic function $\chi_\rho(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ is a correct h-function.

Let

$$\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ l \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i 2^{il}.$$

One can note that if the condition $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1} < 2^l$ is satisfied for any i ($0 \leqslant i < n$) then the binary digits of the number $\langle x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1};\ l \rangle$ from (il)-th up to $(il + l - 1)$-th generate the binary notation of the number x_i.

2.2. Coincidence of classes FFOM, FFOM$^{\text{alt}}$ and FFOM$^{\text{var}}$

Statement 1.2.2.1. FFOM = FFOM$^{\text{alt}}$.

Proof. It is easy to notice that the definitions of classes FFOM and FFOM$^{\text{alt}}$ differ only with respect to how one encodes number arrays by strings of symbols, such that the equivalency of these encodings is obvious (see the equivalent definitions of the class FOM from [14]; for example based on the sequence of boolean circuits that are generated by a Turing machine). □

Statement 1.2.2.2. FFOM$^{\text{alt}}$ = FFOM$^{\text{var}}$.

Proof. The inclusion FFOM$^{\text{var}} \subseteq$ FFOM$^{\text{alt}}$ can be proved analogously to the statement 1.2.2.1. One can prove the inclusion FFOM$^{\text{alt}} \subseteq$ FFOM$^{\text{var}}$.

[2]this definition differs from the one used it the section 1

Let $f \in \mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{alt}}$, k is a number that satisfies (1.6) for all $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Besides, let $\rho \in \mathrm{FOM}$ be the predicate from the definition of $\mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{alt}}$ for f and k, Φ is a FOM-formula over the variables $z_1, \ldots, z_m$ from the definition of FOM for ρ.

By Ψ one can denote the FOM-formula over variables $z_1, \ldots, z_m, u, v, w, y$, that one obtains from Φ by substituting every subformula of the form $X\langle t \rangle$, where t is a FOM-term, to

$$\exists u(t = 2u \ \& \ \mathrm{BIT}(y, u)) \vee \exists v \exists w(w = 2v \ \& \ w = t + 1 \ \& \ X\langle v \rangle), \qquad (1.7)$$

with this, the auxiliary sub-formulas are being replaced based on equalities

$$(x > y) \equiv (x \geqslant y) \& \neg(y \geqslant x),$$

$$(y = x + 1) \equiv y > x \ \& \ \neg \exists u(y > u \ \& \ u > x),$$

$$(y = 2x) \equiv \forall u \forall v(u = v + 1 \to (\mathrm{BIT}(y, u) \leftrightarrow \mathrm{BIT}(x, v)))$$

$$\& \ \neg \mathrm{BIT}(y, 1) \ \& \ \neg \mathrm{BIT}(x, |X|).$$

Let $\psi(X, z_1, \ldots, z_m, u, v, w, y)$ be the corresponding to the formula Ψ predicate.

One can note that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y$ such that $1 \leqslant y \leqslant |\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|$, it holds that

$$|\mathrm{CODE}^{\mathrm{alt}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n;\ y - 1)| = |\mathrm{CODE}^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|,$$

i.e. when calculating

$$\rho(\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{alt}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n;\ y - 1))$$

and

$$\psi(\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n), z_1, \ldots, z_m, u, v, w, y)$$

the quantifiers will have the same variable ranges.

Based on this and the fact that the expression (1.7) exhibits the needed recoding (obviously), one can easily see that for all arrays $(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y)$ such that $1 \leqslant y \leqslant |\mathrm{CODE}^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|$, the following statement holds true: for any u, v, w it is true that

$$\psi(\mathrm{CODE}^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n), z_1, \ldots, z_m, u, v, w, y) \equiv (f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\langle y - 1 \rangle = 1).$$

Thereby, $f \in \mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{var}}$. The statement is proved. $\square$

2.3. Overview of Some Functions That Belong to the Class $[T']$

Statement 1.2.3.1. *All constants as well as functions* $\mathrm{sg}(x)$, $\mathrm{rm}(x,y)$, xy *belong to* $[T']$.

Proof. Let $f(x) = 2^{[\log_2 x]^2}$. One can note that $0 = x \div x$, $1 = f(0)$, the remaining constants can be obtained from these with the help of the function $x + y$.

It is obvious that $\mathrm{sg}(x) = 1 \div (1 \div x)$, $\mathrm{rm}(x,y) = (x \div [x/y] \cdot y) \cdot \mathrm{sg}(y)$.

Let $g(x) = f(x+x)$. One can note that for all x it is true that $g(x) \geqslant x^2$, thus $g(g(x+y)) \geqslant (x+y)^4 > 2x^2y^2 \geqslant x^2y^2 + xy$ for all $x, y \geqslant 1$. One can prove that

$$xy = \left[\frac{g(g(x+y))}{[g(g(x+y))/x]/y}\right].$$

For $xy = 0$ it is obvious. If $x, y \geqslant 1$, then it follows from the fact that $[A/x]/y = [A/(xy)]$, where $A = g(g(x+y))$, and the chain of relationships

$$xy \leqslant \frac{A}{\left[\frac{A}{xy}\right]} < \frac{A}{\frac{A}{xy} - 1} < xy + 1,$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $A > x^2y^2 + xy$. The statement is proved. □

Let

$$\mathrm{ssqrt}(y) = y \div \left(\left[\frac{\left(\left[\frac{f(y)^4 \div 1}{y^2 \div 1}\right] \wedge (f(y) \div 1)\right) \cdot \left[\frac{[f(y)^4/2] \div 1}{[y^2/2] \div 1}\right]}{[2f(y)/y^3]}\right] \wedge (y \div 1)\right),$$

where $f(y) = 2^{[\log_2 y]^2}$. One can note that $\mathrm{ssqrt} \in [T']$.

Statement 1.2.3.2. *For any* x *it holds that*

$$\mathrm{ssqrt}(2^{2x}) = 2^x.$$

Proof. If $x = 0$, then the statement is obvious. Let $x \geqslant 1$. One can assume that $y = 2^{2x}$. Then $f(y) = 2^{4x^2}$.

By using the geometric progression sum formula, one obtains

$$A = \frac{f(y)^4 \div 1}{y^2 \div 1} = \frac{2^{16x^2} - 1}{2^{4x} - 1} = \sum_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant 4x-1} 2^{4xi}.$$

Analogously, one obtains

$$B = \left[\frac{[f(y)^4/2] \div 1}{[y^2/2] \div 1} \right] = \frac{2^{16x^2-1} - 1}{2^{4x-1} - 1} = \sum_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant 4x} 2^{(4x-1)i}.$$

One can note that the binary notation of the number $f(y) \div 1$ is actually $4x^2$ of consecutive ones, one obtains that

$$C = A \wedge (f(y) \div 1) = \sum_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant x-1} 2^{4xi}.$$

Thereby,

$$B \cdot C = \left(\sum_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant 4x} 2^{(4x-1)i} \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant x-1} 2^{4xi} \right) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leqslant i \leqslant 4x \\ 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-1}} 2^{(4x-1)(i+j)+j}.$$

One can note that in the last sum all powers are different, thus the ones in the binary notation $B \cdot C$ stay on positions of type $(4x-1)(i+j)+j$ $(\,0 \leqslant i \leqslant 4x\,,\ 0 \leqslant j \leqslant x-1\,)$ and only in those.

It is obvious that $D = [BC/[2f(y)/y^3]] \wedge (y \div 1)$ is a number the binary notation of which is obtained from the binary notation of BC with a shift to the right by $(4x-1)(x-1)-x$ digit places and removal of all digit places but the $2x$ lowest order ones. From this it follows that $D = 2^{2x} - 2^x$ or $y - D = 2^x$. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.2.3.3. *It holds that*

$$2^{[\log_2 x]},\ 2^{[\log_2 x] \cdot [\log_2 y]},\ [\log_2 x] \in [T'].$$

Proof. Let $f(x) = 2^{[\log_2 x]^2}$. Then using the statement 1.2.3.2 it is easy to obtain that

$$2^{[\log_2 x]} = \operatorname{ssqrt}\left(\left[\frac{f(2x)}{2f(x)} \right] \right) \cdot \operatorname{sg}(x) + (1 \div \operatorname{sg}(x)),$$

$$2^{[\log_2 x]\cdot[\log_2 y]} = \operatorname{ssqrt}\left(\left[\frac{f(2^{[\log_2 x]}\cdot 2^{[\log_2 y]})}{f(x)\cdot f(y)}\right]\right).$$

From these formulas follows the statement that one proved for the first two functions.

Let $l = [\log_2 x]$. One can note that

$$\left(\frac{2l^2 \div 1}{2^l \div 1}\right)^2 = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{l-1} 2^{il}\right)^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} 2^{il}(i+1) + \sum_{i=l}^{2(l-1)} 2^{il}(2l-1-i).$$

By considering the binary notation of the obtained number, one arrives at the following result

$$l = \operatorname{rm}\left(\left[\frac{2l^2 \div 1}{2^l \div 1}\right]^2 / \left[\frac{2^{l^2}}{2^l}\right], 2^l\right).$$

From this and from the fact that $2^l, 2^{l^2} \in [T']$ follows the statement that one was trying to prove. □

2.4. The Correctness of Predicates that Correspond to FOM-formulas

Statement 1.2.4.1. *If* $f_1, f_2 \in [T']^{\log}$, *then* $f_1 + f_2,\ f_1 \div f_2,\ f_1 \cdot f_2 \in [T']^{\log}$. *Besides, if* $f \in [T']^{\log}$, *then* $f, 2^f \in [T']$.

Proof. Indeed, if $f_1 = [\log_2 g_1]$, $f_2 = [\log_2 g_2]$, where $g_1, g_2 \in [T']$, then

$$f_1 + f_2 = [\log_2(2^{[\log_2 g_1]}\cdot 2^{[\log_2 g_2]})],$$

$$f_1 \div f_2 = [\log_2[2^{[\log_2 g_1]}/2^{[\log_2 g_2]}]],$$

$$f_1 \cdot f_2 = [\log_2 2^{[\log_2 g_1][\log_2 g_2]}],$$

Minding the statement 1.2.3.3 these functions are in $[T']^{\log}$.

The last part of the statement follows directly from the statement 1.2.3.3. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.2.4.2. *If*

$$g(y,z) = \sum_{x<y} 2^{xz} x,$$

then $g([\log_2 y], [\log_2 z]) \in [T']$.

Proof. This follows from well known formulas of summation and the statement 1.2.3.3. □

Statement 1.2.4.3. *If t is a* FOM*-term, then its corresponding function $h_t(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ is correct together with the function 2^{h_t-1}.*

Proof. There are three possible cases.

- $h_t(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) = 1$. In this case for it and for 2^{h_t-1} the following function is appropriate (as the function from the definition of correctness)

$$f(x, z) = \sum_{1 \leqslant y_1, \ldots, y_m \leqslant l} 2^{(y_1-1)l+(y_2-1)l^2+\ldots+(y_m-1)l^m} = \left[\frac{2^{l^{m+1}} \div 1}{2^l \div 1}\right],$$

  here and further in the proof of this statement l is a contracted notation for $[\log_2 z]$. From the statement 1.2.3.3 it follows that $f(x, z) \in [T']$.

- $h_t(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) = |X|$. In this case one can use the function

$$f(x, z) = \sum_{1 \leqslant y_1, \ldots, y_m \leqslant l} 2^{(y_1-1)l+(y_2-1)l^2+\ldots+(y_m-1)l^m} l = \left[\frac{2^{l^{m+1}} \div 1}{2^l \div 1}\right] \cdot l,$$

  for 2^{h_t-1} the suitable function is

$$f'(x, z) = \left[\frac{2^{l^{m+1}} \div 1}{2^l \div 1}\right] \cdot \left[\frac{2^l}{2}\right].$$

  Further reasoning is analogous to the previous point.

- $h_t(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) = y_i$. For h_t the suitable function is

$$f(x, z) = \sum_{1 \leqslant y_1, \ldots, y_m \leqslant l} 2^{(y_1-1)l+\ldots+(y_m-1)l^m} y_i =$$

$$= \left(\sum_{y_1=1}^{l} 2^{(y_1-1)l}\right) \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\sum_{y_{i-1}=1}^{l} 2^{(y_{i-1}-1)l^{i-1}}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{y_i=1}^{l} 2^{(y_i-1)l^i} y_i\right).$$

$$\cdot \left(\sum_{y_{i+1}=1}^{l} 2^{(y_{i+1}-1)l^{i+1}} \right) \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\sum_{y_m=1}^{l} 2^{(y_m-1)l^m} \right),$$

with this for 2^{h_t-1} a suitable function is $f'(x,z)$ that can be expressed by an analogous formula with a substitution of the i-th factor by $\sum_{y_i=1}^{l} 2^{(y_i-1)l^i+(y_i-1)}$. From the statements 1.2.4.2, 1.2.3.3 and the formula of the geometric progression sum, it follows that $f, f' \in [T']$.

The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.2.4.4. *The following functions are in* $[T']$ *(definitions can be looked up in the section 1):*

$$\mathrm{rep}(x, [\log_2 n], [\log_2 l]),$$

$$\mathrm{incrx}(x, [\log_2 n], [\log_2 l_1], [\log_2 l_2]),$$

$$\mathrm{swap}_n(x, [\log_2 q], [\log_2 k_1], \ldots, [\log_2 k_n], [\log_2 m_1], \ldots, [\log_2 m_n]),$$

$$\mathrm{incr}(x, [\log_2 q], [\log_2 l]),$$

$$\mathrm{decr}(x, [\log_2 q], [\log_2 l]),$$

$$\mathrm{not}(x, [\log_2 n]),$$

$$\mathrm{or}(x, y, [\log_2 n]),$$

$$\mathrm{cmp}(x, y, [\log_2 n], [\log_2 l]),$$

$$\mathrm{cmpeq}(x, y, [\log_2 n], [\log_2 l]),$$

$$\mathrm{sum}(x, [\log_2 n], [\log_2 l], [\log_2 k]).$$

Proof. It follows from the formulas for these functions (see section 1) and statement 1.2.4.1. □

One can assume that

$$\mathrm{reverse}(x, n) = \mathrm{decr} \left(\left[\frac{\mathrm{rep}(x, n, n) \wedge \left[\frac{2^{n^2 \div 1} \div 2^{n \div 1}}{2^{n \div 1} \div 1} \right]}{2^{n \div 1}} \right], n, n \div 1 \right).$$

One can notice that $\mathrm{reverse}(x, [\log_2 n]) \in [T']$ (it follows from the statements 1.2.4.1 and 1.2.4.4).

Statement 1.2.4.5. *If* $a_0 \ldots a_{n-1}$ *is a binary notation of* x*, then* $a_{n-1} \ldots a_0$ *is a binary notation of* $\mathrm{reverse}(x, n)$ *(the binary notation can have any number of zeroes on the right).*

Proof. One can contend that (statement 1.1.4.2):

$$\mathrm{rep}(x, n, n) = \langle \underbrace{a_{n-1}, \ldots, a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}, \ldots, a_0}_{n \text{ times}};\ 1 \rangle,$$

using the geometric progression sum formula

$$\left[\frac{2^{n^2 \div 1} \div 2^{n \div 1}}{2^{n \div 1} \div 1} \right] = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 2^{(n-1)(i+1)}.$$

From this it follows that

$$\left[\left(\mathrm{rep}(x, n, n) \wedge \left[\frac{2^{n^2 \div 1} \div 2^{n \div 1}}{2^{n \div 1} \div 1} \right] \right) / 2^{n \div 1} \right] = \langle a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1};\ n - 1 \rangle.$$

Based on this and the claim 1.1.4.6 one obtains the claim that one was trying to prove. □

Statement 1.2.4.6. *If* Φ *is an elementary* FOM*-formula, then its corresponding predicate* $\rho_\Phi(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ *is correct.*

Proof. There can be three cases.

- Φ is $t_1 \leqslant t_2$, where t_1, t_2 are FOM-terms. Let those terms correspond to h-functions $h_1(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ and $h_2(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ respectively. From the statement 1.2.4.3 it follows that the functions h_1, h_2 are correct. Let the functions $f_1(x, z), f_2(x, z) \in [T']$ correspond to them. Let

  $$f(x, z) = \mathrm{cmp}(f_2(x, z), f_1(x, z), [\log_2 z]^m, [\log_2 z]).$$

  From the statements 1.2.4.1 and 1.2.4.4 it follows that $f \in [T']$.

  Besides, for any $X \in \{0, 1\}^+$, $l = |X|$ if x is a number in binary notation X, then it holds that

  $$f_i(x, 2^l) = \langle h_i(1, 1, \ldots, 1), h_i(2, 1, \ldots, 1), \ldots, h_i(l, \ldots, l);\ l \rangle,$$

$i = 1, 2$ (vectors in reverse lexicographical order), thus (the statement 1.1.4.9) it holds true that

$$\operatorname{cmp}(f_2(x, 2^l), f_1(x, 2^l), l^m, l)$$
$$= \langle \sigma(1, 1, \ldots, 1), \sigma(2, 1, \ldots, 1), \ldots, \sigma(l, \ldots, l);\ l \rangle,$$

where

$$\sigma(y_1, \ldots, y_m) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } h_1(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) \leqslant h_2(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m), \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From this it follows that $f(x, z)$ complies with the definition of correctness for a predicate $(h_1 \leqslant h_2)$.

- Φ is $\mathrm{BIT}(t_1, t_2)$. Let the function $h_i(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ correspond to a term t_i $(i = 1, 2)$, $f_1(x, z)$, $f_2(x, z)$ are the functions from the definitions of correctness for h_1 and $2^{h_2 - 1}$ respectively. Put

$$f'(x, z) = \operatorname{cmpeq}(f_1(x, z) \wedge f_2(x, z), 0, [\log_2 z]^m, [\log_2 z]).$$

Analogously to the previous point one obtains the fact that when satisfying similar conditions over $X \in \{0, 1\}^+$ and $l, x \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the following takes place

$$f'(x, 2^l) = \langle \sigma(1, 1, \ldots, 1), \sigma(2, 1, \ldots, 1), \ldots, \sigma(l, \ldots, l);\ l \rangle,$$

where

$$\sigma(y_1, \ldots, y_m) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } h_1(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) \wedge 2^{h_2(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) - 1} = 0, \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to notice that $\sigma(y_1, \ldots, y_m) = 1$ if and only if

$$h_1(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) \langle h_2(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) - 1 \rangle = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$f(x, z) = \operatorname{rep}(1, [\log_2 z]^m, [\log_2 z]) \div f'(x, z)$$

fits the definition of correctness for ρ_Φ ($f \in [T']$ follows from statements 1.2.4.1, 1.2.4.4).

- Φ is $X\langle t\rangle$, term t corresponds to $h_t(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$, $f_0(x, z)$ is a function from the definition of correctness for 2^{h_t-1}. Function $f(x, z)$ is defined analogously to the previous point with a substitution $f_1(x, z)$ to

$$\mathrm{rep}(\mathrm{reverse}(x, [\log_2 z]), [\log_2 z]^m, [\log_2 z]),$$

$f_2(x, z)$ to $f_0(x, z)$. The fact that $f(x, z)$ fits the definition of correctness for ρ_Φ, follows from the statements 1.1.4.2, 1.2.4.5 and reasoning analogous to the previous point.

The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.2.4.7. *Let $h(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ be a correct h-function, $h'(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ that one obtains from h by permuting variables $y_1, \ldots, y_m$. Then h' is also a correct function.*

Proof. Let

$$h(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m) = h'(X, y_{j_1}, \ldots, y_{j_m}),$$

where $(j_1, \ldots, j_m)$ is some permutation of numbers $1, \ldots, m$. Besides, let $f(x, z) \in [T']$ be a function from the definition of correctness for h,

$$f'(x, z) = \mathrm{swap}(f(x, z), l, l, l^2, \ldots, l^m, l^{j_1}, l^{j_2}, \ldots, l^{j_m}),$$

where $l = [\log_2 z]$. One will prove that $f'(x, z)$ complies with the definition of correctness for h'. Let $X \in \{0, 1\}^+$, x be a number in binary notation X, $l = |X|$. Thus,

$$f'(x, 2^l) =$$

$$= \mathrm{swap}\left(\sum_{1 \leqslant y_1, \ldots, y_m \leqslant l} 2^{(y_1-1)l+\ldots+(y_m-1)l^m} h(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m),\ l,\ l, l^2, \ldots, l^m, l^{j_1}, \ldots, l^{j_m}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{1 \leqslant y_1, \ldots, y_m \leqslant l} 2^{(y_1-1)l^{j_1}+\ldots+(y_m-1)l^{j_m}} h(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$$

$$= \sum_{1 \leqslant u_1, \ldots, u_m \leqslant l} 2^{(u_1-1)l+\ldots+(u_m-1)l^m} h'(X, u_1, \ldots, u_m),$$

the second equality follows from the statement 1.1.4.4. From statements 1.2.4.1 and 1.2.4.4 it follows that $f' \in [T']$. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.2.4.8. *If Φ is a* FOM *-formula, then its corresponding predicate $\rho_\Phi(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ is correct.*

Proof. One can prove this by induction on construction of a formula. Let this formula Φ have a corresponding predicate $\varphi(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$. There are the following cases.

- Φ is an elementary FOM-formula. Then this follows from the statement 1.2.4.6.
- Φ is $(\mathrm{M}y_i)(\Psi)$, to formula Ψ it corresponds the correct predicate $\psi(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$, $f_\psi(x, z)$ is the function from the definition of correctness for ψ (more specifically, from the definition of correctness from the characteristic function of ψ). Minding statement 1.2.4.7 one can suppose that $i = 1$. One can assume that

$$g(x, z) = \mathrm{sum}(f_\psi(x, z), [\log_2 z]^{m-1}, [\log_2 z], [\log_2 z]),$$
$$p(x, z) = \mathrm{rep}([[\log_2 z]/2] + 1, [\log_2 z]^{m-1}, [\log_2 z]^2),$$
$$r(x, z) = \mathrm{cmp}(g(x, z), p(x, z), [\log_2 z]^{m-1}, [\log_2 z]^2),$$
$$f_\varphi(x, z) = \left[\frac{2^{[\log_2 z]^2} \div 1}{2^{[\log_2 z]} \div 1}\right] \cdot r(x, z).$$

  One can prove that f_φ fits the definition of correctness for φ. Let $X \in \{0, 1\}^+$, $l = |X|$, x is the number with binary notation X (perhaps completed with zeroes from the left). From the statement 1.1.4.14 it follows that

$$g(x, 2^l) = \langle s(1, 1, \ldots, 1), s(2, 1, \ldots, 1), \ldots, s(l, l, \ldots, l);\ l^2\rangle,$$

  where $s(y_2, \ldots, y_m)$ is the number of y_1 such that $1 \leqslant y_1 \leqslant l$ and $\psi(X, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ hold true. From this and the statements 1.1.4.2, 1.1.4.9 it follows that

$$r(x, 2^l) = \langle v(1, 1, \ldots, 1), v(2, 1, \ldots, 1), \ldots, v(l, l, \ldots, l);\ l^2\rangle,$$

  where

$$v(y_2, \ldots, y_m) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } s(y_2, \ldots, y_m) > l/2, \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

  Using the geometric progression sum formula, one obtains

$$f_\varphi(x, 2^l) =$$

$$= \left(\sum_{y_1=1}^{l} 2^{(y_1-1)l}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{1\leqslant y_2,\ldots,y_m\leqslant l} 2^{(y_2-1)l^2+\ldots+(y_m-1)l^m} v(y_2,\ldots,y_m)\right)$$

$$= \sum_{1\leqslant y_1,y_2,\ldots,y_m\leqslant l} 2^{(y_1-1)l+\ldots+(y_m-1)l^m} \chi_\varphi(X, y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m).$$

$f_\varphi \in [T']$ follows from the statements 1.2.4.1 and 1.2.4.4.

- Φ looks like $(\exists y_i)(\Psi)$ or $(\forall y_i)(\Psi)$. It is considered analogously to the previous point.

- Φ looks like $(\Psi_1 \vee \Psi_2)$. Let ψ_i be the correct predicate that corresponds to Ψ_i, $f_i(x,z)$ is the function from the definition of correctness for ψ_i $(i = 1, 2)$. It is easy to notice that

  $$f(x,z) = \mathrm{or}(f_1(x,z), f_2(x,z), [\log_2 z]^{m+1})$$

  complies with the definition of correctness for φ (see statements 1.2.4.1, 1.2.4.4, 1.1.4.7).

- Φ looks like $(\Psi_1 \& \Psi_2)$ or $(\neg\Psi)$. Should have treatment analogous to the previous point, except instead of the function or one needs to use $x \wedge y$ or not respectively.

The statement is proved. □

2.5. Proof of Theorem 2

Statement 1.2.5.1. *For any $n, k \geqslant 1$ the functions $\mathrm{code}_{n,k}$ and $\mathrm{lcode}_{n,k}$, such that for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ it satisfies*

$$\mathrm{lcode}_{n,k}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = |\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|$$

and the binary notation of $\mathrm{code}_{n,k}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ (possibly completed by zeroes from the left) is $\mathrm{CODE}_k^{\mathrm{var}}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, belong to $[T']$ and $[T']^{\log}$ respectively.

Proof. From $\mathrm{sg}(x) = [\log_2(2\mathrm{sg}(x))]$, (4) and the statement 1.2.4.1 it follows that $\mathrm{len}(x) \in [T']^{\log}$.

Based on this and the statement 1.2.4.1 and by noticing that

$$\mathrm{lcode}_{n,k}(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = 2^{k+1}(\mathrm{len}(x_1)+\ldots+\mathrm{len}(x_n)+n+1)^k,$$

one obtains that $\mathrm{lcode}_{n,k} \in [T']^{\log}$.

Let $f(x) = 3\cdot\mathrm{incr}(x,[\log_2 x]+1,2)$. One can notice that for any x it is true that if the binary notation of x is $a_1,\ldots,a_m$, then the binary notation of $f(x)$ is $a_1a_1a_2a_2\ldots a_ma_m$ (this follows from the statement 1.1.4.5).

Further, one can notice that

$$\mathrm{code}_{n,k}(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(2^{l\div(2i+l_1+\ldots+l_{i-1})} + 2^{l\div(2i+l_1+\ldots+l_i)}f(x_i)) + 1,$$

where l is a contracted notation for $\mathrm{lcode}_{n,k}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ and l_i is for $2\cdot\mathrm{len}(x_i)$ $(1\leqslant i\leqslant n)$.

From the statements 1.2.4.1 and 1.2.4.4 it follows that $\mathrm{code}_{n,k}\in[T']$. □

Statement 1.2.5.2. $\mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{var}} \subseteq [T']$.

Proof. Let $f(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\in\mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{var}}$, k is the number from the definition $\mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{var}}$ for f, $\rho(X,z_1,\ldots,z_m,y)$ is the predicate from the definition that corresponds to the number k. From the statement 1.2.4.8 it follows that ρ is correct. Let $g(x,z)$ be the function from the definition of correctness for ρ (specifically, from the definition of correctness for the characteristic function of ρ).

Let one assume that

$$r(\tilde{x}) = \left[\frac{g(\mathrm{code}_{n,k}(\tilde{x}),2^l)}{[(2^{l^{m+1}}\div 1)/(2^l\div 1)]}\right],$$

where l is a contraction for $\mathrm{lcode}_{n,k}(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$, the functions $\mathrm{code}_{n,k}$ and $\mathrm{lcode}_{n,k}$ were taken from the statement 1.2.5.1.

One can notice that (see definitions of $\mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{var}}$ and the one concerning correctness)

$$g(\mathrm{code}_{n,k}(\tilde{x}),2^l) =$$

$$= \sum_{1\leqslant z_1,\ldots,z_m,y\leqslant l} 2^{(z_1-1)l+\ldots+(z_m-1)l^m+(y-1)l^{m+1}}\chi_\rho(\mathrm{CODE}^{\mathrm{var}}_k(\tilde{x}),z_1,\ldots,z_m,y) =$$

$$= \sum_{1 \leqslant z_1,\ldots,z_m,y \leqslant l} 2^{(z_1-1)l+\ldots+(z_m-1)l^m+(y-1)l^{m+1}} f(\tilde{x})\langle y-1\rangle =$$

$$= \left[\frac{2^{l^{m+1}} \div 1}{2^l \div 1}\right] \cdot \sum_{y=0}^{l-1} 2^{l^{m+1}y} f(\tilde{x})\langle y\rangle.$$

Consequently,

$$r(\tilde{x}) = \sum_{y=0}^{l-1} 2^{l^{m+1}y} f(\tilde{x})\langle y\rangle = \langle f(\tilde{x})\langle 0\rangle, \ldots, f(\tilde{x})\langle l-1\rangle;\ l^{m+1}\rangle,$$

that is

$$\mathrm{decr}(r(\tilde{x}), l, l^{m+1}) = \langle f(\tilde{x})\langle 0\rangle, \ldots, f(\tilde{x})\langle l-1\rangle;\ 1\rangle = f(\tilde{x}).$$

From the statements 1.2.4.1, 1.2.4.4 and 1.2.5.1 it follows that $f(\tilde{x}) \in [T']$. The statement is proved. □

Based on equivalent definitions of class FOM from [14] one can easily obtain the following statement.

Statement 1.2.5.3. FFOM *is closed with respect to superposition.*

Proof of theorem 2. Based on statements 1.2.2.1 and 1.2.2.2 one obtains that $\mathrm{FFOM} = \mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{var}}$. Besides from the statements 1.1.2.9 and 1.2.5.3 it follows that

$$\left[x+y, \quad x \div y, \quad x \wedge y, \quad [x/y], \quad x^{[\log_2 y]}\right] \subseteq \mathrm{FFOM}.$$

One can note that $2^{[\log_2 x]^2} = ((x^{[\log_2(x \div x)]} + x^{[\log_2(x \div x)]})^{[\log_2 x]})^{[\log_2 x]}$. Based on all of that and the statement 1.2.5.2, one has the following consequence

$$\mathrm{FFOM} = \mathrm{FFOM}^{\mathrm{var}} \subseteq [T'] \subseteq$$

$$\subseteq \left[x+y, \quad x \div y, \quad x \wedge y, \quad [x/y], \quad x^{[\log_2 y]}\right] \subseteq \mathrm{FFOM}.$$

Theorem is proved.

3. Hierarchies of Classes that are Exhaustive with Regard to Kalmar Elementary Functions and Formulas of an Arbitrary Height

3.1. Definitions

Let one define the class XS^n_+ as a set of all functions $f(\tilde{x})$, for each of which there exist functions $g(\tilde{x}, y) \in \mathrm{XS}$ and $m(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{P}^n$ such that

$$f(\tilde{x}) = g(\tilde{x}, m(\tilde{x})).$$

3.2. Coincidence of Classes XS^n and XS^n_+

Statement 1.3.2.1. *For any functions $f_1(\tilde{x}), \ldots, f_k(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{XS}^n$ there exist functions $m(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{P}^n$ and $g_1(\tilde{x}, y, z), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{x}, y, z) \in \mathrm{S}$ such that*

$$f_i(\tilde{x})\langle y\rangle = g_i(\tilde{x}, y, m(\tilde{x})),$$

$$f_i(\tilde{x}) < 2^{m(\tilde{x})}$$

for any $\tilde{x}$, y, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, the functions g_i only takes values 0 and 1, and $g_i(\tilde{x}, y, z) = 0$ for $y \geqslant z$.

Proof. From the definitions of P^{n+1} and XS^n it follows that there exist functions $g'_i(\tilde{x}, y, z) \in \mathrm{S}$, $m^i_1(\tilde{x}), m^i_2(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{P}^n$ such that $f_i(\tilde{x})\langle y\rangle = g'_i(\tilde{x}, y, m^i_1(\tilde{x}))$, $f_i(\tilde{x}) < 2^{m^i_2(\tilde{x})}$ ($i = 1, \ldots, k$). Let one pick a function $m(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{P}^n$, dominating m^i_1 and m^i_2 for all i. Let one assume

$$g_i(\tilde{x}, y, z) = \min(g'_i(\tilde{x}, y, \min(m^i_1(\tilde{x}), z)), 1) \cdot \chi_{y<z}(y, z), \quad i = 1, \ldots, k.$$

It is obvious that $g_i \in \mathrm{S}$ and functions g_i, m satisfy the conditions. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.3.2.2. $\mathrm{XS}^n \subseteq \mathrm{XS}^n_+$ *for any n.*

Proof. Let $f(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{XS}^n$. One can prove that $f(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{XS}^n_+$. According to the statement 1.3.2.1 one can choose functions $m(\tilde{x})$ and $g(\tilde{x}, y, z)$.

Let one assume

$$h(\tilde{x}, z) = \sum_{y=0}^{z-1} g(\tilde{x}, y, z) \cdot 2^y.$$

From the fact that $g(\tilde{x}, y, z) = 0$ for $y \geqslant z$, it follows that it is true that

$$h(\tilde{x}, z)\langle y\rangle = g(\tilde{x}, y, z).$$

Besides, $h(\tilde{x}, z) < 2^z$, thus $h \in \mathrm{XS}$. From the fact that $g(\tilde{x}, y, m(\tilde{x})) = f(\tilde{x})\langle y\rangle$ for any $\tilde{x}$ and y, it follows that there is

$$h(\tilde{x}, m(\tilde{x})) = f(\tilde{x}).$$

The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.3.2.3. $\mathrm{XS}^n_+ \subseteq \mathrm{XS}^n$ *for any* n.

Proof. Let $f(\tilde{x}) = g(\tilde{x}, m(\tilde{x}))$, $g \in \mathrm{XS}$, $m \in \mathrm{P}^n$. One has

$$f(\tilde{x})\langle y\rangle = g(\tilde{x}, m(\tilde{x}))\langle y\rangle,$$

$g(\tilde{x}, z)\langle y\rangle \in \mathrm{S}$ (by definition of XS).

The boundedness of f by some function from P^{n+1} is obvious. The statement is proved. □

Consequence. $\mathrm{XS}^n = \mathrm{XS}^n_+$ *for any* n.

3.3. Proof of Theorem 3

Statement 1.3.3.1. *If* $f \in \mathrm{XS}^n$, *then* $2^f \in \mathrm{XS}^{n+1}$.

Proof. Let one choose according to the statement 1.3.2.1 functions $m(\tilde{x})$ and $g(\tilde{x}, y, z)$ for $f(\tilde{x})$. It is obvious that

$$2^{f(\tilde{x})}\langle y\rangle = \chi_\rho(\tilde{x}, y),$$

where

$$\rho(\tilde{x}, y) \equiv (y = f(\tilde{x})) \equiv (\forall t)(y\langle t\rangle = f(\tilde{x})\langle t\rangle) \equiv (\forall t)(y\langle t\rangle = g(\tilde{x}, t, m(\tilde{x}))) \equiv$$

$$\equiv (y < 2^{m(\tilde{x})})\&(\forall t)_{t<m(\tilde{x})}(y\langle t\rangle = g(\tilde{x}, t, m(\tilde{x}))).$$

The last equality follows from the fact that $f(\tilde{x}) < 2^{m(\tilde{x})}$ and from the fact that $g(\tilde{x}, y, z) = 0$ for $y \geqslant z$. Let

$$\varphi(\tilde{x}, y, z) \equiv (y < z)\&(\forall t)_{t<[\log_2 z]}(y\langle t\rangle = g(\tilde{x}, t, [\log_2 z])).$$

It is obvious that $\varphi \in \mathrm{S}_*$ and $\rho(\tilde{x}, y) \equiv \varphi(\tilde{x}, y, 2^{m(\tilde{x})})$. From this it follows that

$$2^{f(\tilde{x})}\langle y\rangle = \chi_\varphi(\tilde{x}, y, 2^{m(\tilde{x})}),$$

$\chi_\varphi \in \mathrm{S}$. The boundedness of 2^f by some function from P^{n+2} is obvious. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.3.3.2. $[T]^{n+1}_{x^y} \subseteq \mathrm{XS}^n$ *for any* n.

Proof. It is obvious that to prove this one needs to prove the following statements:

1. If $f(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{XS}^n$, then $f(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{XS}^{n+1}$. Let one choose for $f(\tilde{x})$ the functions $m(\tilde{x})$, $g(\tilde{x}, y, z)$ according to the statement 1.3.2.1. One gets

   $$f(\tilde{x})\langle y\rangle = g(\tilde{x}, y, m(\tilde{x})) = h(\tilde{x}, y, 2^{m(\tilde{x})}),$$

   where

   $$h(\tilde{x}, y, z) = g(\tilde{x}, y, [\log_2 z]).$$

   It is obvious that $h \in \mathrm{S}$.

   Compliance with the restrictions on the speed of growth is obvious.

2. If $f \in \mathrm{XS}^n$, g is obtained from f by permutation, identification of variables or introduction of dummy variables, then $g \in \mathrm{XS}^n$. This is obviously satisfied.

3. If $h(y_1, \ldots, y_k) \in T$ and $f_1(\tilde{x}), \ldots, f_k(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{XS}^n$, then $h(f_1(\tilde{x}), \ldots, f_k(\tilde{x})) \in \mathrm{XS}^n$. From the fact that $\mathrm{XS}^n = \mathrm{XS}^n_+$ it follows that $f_1, \ldots, f_k \in \mathrm{XS}^n_+$. I.e.

   $$f_i(\tilde{x}) = g_i(\tilde{x}, m(\tilde{x})), \quad i = 1, \ldots, k,$$

   where $g_i \in \mathrm{XS}$, $m \in \mathrm{P}^n$ (function m can be assumed to be unified for all f_i, see the proof of the statement 1.3.2.1). Thereby,

   $$h(f_1(\tilde{x}), \ldots, f_k(\tilde{x})) = h(g_1(\tilde{x}, m(\tilde{x})), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{x}, m(\tilde{x}))).$$

   It is obvious that $h(g_1(\tilde{x}, z), \ldots, g_k(\tilde{x}, z)) \in \mathrm{XS}$ (see [36]). Thus, $h(f_1, \ldots, f_k) \in \mathrm{XS}^n_+$ (and XS^n).

4. If $f \in \mathrm{XS}^{n+1}$ and $g \in \mathrm{XS}^n$, then $f^g \in \mathrm{XS}^{n+1}$. One has

$$f^g = f^{[\log_2 2^g]}.$$

From the statement 1.3.3.1 it follows that $2^g \in \mathrm{XS}^{n+1}$. Both from this and from that $x^{[\log_2 y]} \in \mathrm{FFOM}$ it follows that $f^g \in \mathrm{XS}^{n+1}$ (see previous point and [36]).

Statement is proved. □

Statement 1.3.3.3. $\mathrm{XS}^n \subseteq [T]_{2^x}^{n+1}$ *for any* n.

Proof. Let $f(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{XS}^n$. Then $f(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{XS}_+^n$, i.e.

$$f(\tilde{x}) = g(\tilde{x}, m(\tilde{x})),$$

where $g \in \mathrm{XS}$, $m \in \mathrm{P}^n$. From [36] it follows that $g \in [T]_{2^x}^1$. Besides it is obvious that $m \in [T]_{2^x}^n$. From all of the above and the definition of $[T]_{2^x}^{n+1}$ follows the proof of the given statement. □

Consequence. $\mathrm{XS}^n = [T]_{2^x}^{n+1} = [T]_{x^y}^{n+1}$ *for any* n.

Proof. Indeed, it is clear that $[T]_{2^x}^{n+1} \subseteq [T]_{x^y}^{n+1}$. Besides, according to the proof above

$$\mathrm{XS}^n \subseteq [T]_{2^x}^{n+1}$$

and

$$[T]_{x^y}^{n+1} \subseteq \mathrm{XS}^n.$$

From this it follows the proof of the given statement. □

Statement 1.3.3.4. *For any* n *there is an inclusion* $\mathrm{FFOM}^{n+1} \subseteq \mathrm{XS}^n$.

Proof. Let $f(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{FFOM}^n$, $\rho(\tilde{x}, y, z) \in \mathrm{FOM}^N$, $m(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{P}^{n+1}$ be the predicate and the function from the definition of FFOM^{n+1} for f. Let one assume $\rho'(\tilde{x}, y, z) \equiv \rho(\tilde{x}, y, 2^z)$. One can note that $\chi_{\rho'} \in \mathrm{S}$ (see [36]). Let $m(\tilde{x}) = 2^{m'(\tilde{x})}$, where $m' \in \mathrm{P}^n$. One gets (for any $\tilde{x}$, y)

$$(f(\tilde{x})\langle y \rangle = 1) \equiv \rho(\tilde{x}, y, m(\tilde{x})) \equiv \rho(\tilde{x}, y, 2^{m'(\tilde{x})}) \equiv \rho'(\tilde{x}, y, m'(\tilde{x})).$$

Thereby, $\chi_{\rho'}$ and m' fit the definition of XS^n for f. The statement is proved. □

Statement 1.3.3.5. $\min(2^x, z) \in \mathrm{FFOM}$.

Proof. This follows from the fact that

$$(\min(2^x, z)\langle y\rangle = 1) \equiv \begin{cases} (x = y), \text{ if } [\log_2 z] \geqslant x, \\ (z\langle y\rangle = 1) \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(see equivalent definitions of the class FOM from [14], for example based on a sequence of boolean circuits generated by Turing machine). □

Statement 1.3.3.6. *For any n it satisfies* $[T]^{n+1}_{2^x} \subseteq \mathrm{FFOM}^{n+1}$.

Proof. Let $f(\tilde{x}) \in [T]^{n+1}_{2^x}$. From the definition of $[T]^{n+1}_{2^x}$ it follows that f can be expressed in terms of a formula over functions in T and the function 2^x (in the formula it is allowed only a substitution of functions and variables into functions), such that for every subformula there is a corresponding function bounded by the function from P^{n+1}. Let $m(\tilde{x}) \in \mathrm{P}^{n+1}$ be the function that bounds all of these functions. Let $g(\tilde{x}, z)$ be the function that can be expressed with this formula with the replacement of every subformula of the type 2^F by $\min(2^F, z)$. One can note that g can be obtained from the superposition of functions from FFOM (see statements 1.1.2.9 and 1.3.3.5). Thereby, from the statement 1.2.5.3 it follows that $g(\tilde{x}, z) \in \mathrm{FFOM}$.

One gets (for any $\tilde{x}, y$)

$$(f(\tilde{x})\langle y\rangle = 1) \equiv (g(\tilde{x}, m(\tilde{x}))\langle y\rangle = 1).$$

From the definition of FFOM it follows that $(g(x, z)\langle y\rangle = 1) \in \mathrm{FOM}^N$. Thus, $f \in \mathrm{FFOM}^{n+1}$. The statement is proved. □

From the consequence of the statement 1.3.3.3 and the statements 1.3.3.4, 1.3.3.6 follows the claim of the theorem 3.

Chapter 2.

Simple Basis by Superposition in the Class $\mathcal{E}^2$ of Grzegorczyk Hierarchy

1. Minsky Machines

Basic definitions can be looked up in sections 3.1 and 3.3 of the introduction.

Minsky Machine there is a multitape non-erasing Turing machine that has a finite number of one-sided, right side infinite tapes, the end cells of which contain symbol 1 and the rest of them contain 0 (see [3, 11]); every tape has one reading head per each, at every step of its work the heads of the Minsky machines can move independently from each other by one cell to the left, right or remain in the same cell. The program of the machine is organized in such a way that the heads cannot move away from the cells that contain symbol 1.

One assumes that the Minsky machine M, that has not less then n tapes calculates everywhere defined function $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, if for every $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ it satisfies the following conditions. If at the beginning of calculating process first n machine heads are in the cells with numbers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ respectively (the end cells are number 0) and the rest of those heads are in the end cells, then at the final step of calculation (when the machine M reaches its final stage) the first head is going to be in the cell number $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

The time of calculation (the number of steps that the machine executes) in this case is labeled $T_M(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

Let machine M have s inside states. These states can be marked with numbers $0, 1, \ldots, s-1$. One can assume that 1 is the initial state and 0 is the

final one. The program of k-tape Minsky machine M consists of commands of the form

$$e_1 \dots e_k q \to d_1 \dots d_k q',$$

where

$$e_1, \dots, e_k \in \{0, 1\}, \quad q, q' \in \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}, \quad q \neq 0, \quad d_1, \dots, d_k \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$$

and $e_i = 1$ implies $d_i \neq -1$. The given command means that if the machine M at some point in time t is in the state q and the vector that is being read by the heads is $(e_1 \dots e_k)$, then at the moment $t+1$ the machine M goes into the state q' and the head with the number i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant k)$ moves to the left by one cell ($d_i = -1$), to the right ($d_i = 1$) or remains in the same cell ($d_i = 0$).

Configuration of k-tape Minksy machine M at the moment of time t will be the tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_k;\ q)$, where x_i is the cell number, in which there is i-th head $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant k)$, q is the inside state of the machine M at the time t.

There is the following description of the class $\mathcal{E}^2$ in terms of Minsky machines calculations.

Theorem ([4, 6]). *$\mathcal{E}^2$ is the set of all functions that can be calculated on Minsky machines in polynomial time. In other words, everywhere defined function $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{E}^2$ if and only if there exists a Minsky machine M and a polynomial $t(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with natural coefficients such that the machine M calculates the function f and for any $x_1, \dots, x_n$ it satisfies the inequality*

$$T_M(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leqslant t(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

The Minsky machine is called *reduced* if at any state q it can read information from only one tape (for every q, generaly speaking its own). The program of a reduced k-tape Minsky machine with s states consists of $s-1$ commands of the form

$$q \to i;\ d_1^0 \dots d_k^0 q^0;\ d_1^1 \dots d_k^1 q^1,$$

where

$$q \in \{1, 2, \dots, s-1\}, \quad 1 \leqslant i \leqslant k, \quad d_1^0, \dots, d_k^0, d_1^1, \dots, d_k^1 \in \{-1, 0, 1\},$$

$q^0, q^1 \in \{0, 1, \ldots, s-1\}$. The given command signifies that if at some point of time t the machine is at state q and i-th head reads the number e, then at the time $t+1$ the machines moves to the state q^e and the head with number j $(1 \leqslant j \leqslant k)$ moves one cell to the left $(d_j^e = -1)$, to the right $(d_j^e = 1)$ or remains at the same spot $(d_j^e = 0)$.

Obviously one step of the work of a generic Minsky machine M can be modeled with k steps of execution of a fitting reduced Minsky machine M', if each state of the machine M will be represented in M' as 2^k states that "remember" binary tuples of length k. Thereby, the following statement holds true.

Statement 2.1.1. *Let Minsky machine M compute everywhere defined function $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Then there exists a reduced Minsky machine M' and the constant C such that M' computes f and*

$$T_{M'}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \leqslant C \cdot T_M(x_1, \ldots, x_n).$$

Consequence. *$\mathcal{E}^2$ is the set of all functions that can be computed on reduced Minsky machines within polynomial time.*

2. Vector-functions, Configurations, and Their Codes

Further one is going to consider everywhere defined vector-functions of the type

$$\tilde{F} : \mathbb{N}_0^k \times \{0, 1, \ldots, s-1\} \to \mathbb{N}_0^k \times \{0, 1, \ldots, s-1\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q)$ be a configuration of the Minsky machine M and

$$e_1 \ldots e_k q \to d_1 \ldots d_k q' \tag{2.2}$$

is a command from the machine M programme such that

$$e_1 = \overline{\mathrm{sg}}(x_1), \ldots, e_k = \overline{\mathrm{sg}}(x_k). \tag{2.3}$$

The command (2.2) transforms configuration $(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q)$ into a subsequent configuration $(x_1 + d_1, \ldots, x_n + d_n;\ q')$.

Overall, for the Minsky machine M the process of transformation of an arbitrary configuration into the next one can be described with the help of a vector function $\mathrm{Con}_M(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q)$, where

$$\mathrm{Con}_M(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q) = (x_1 + d_1, \ldots, x_k + d_k;\ q'),$$

if in the machine program M, there is a command (2.2), the following relations hold (2.3), and

$$\mathrm{Con}_M(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q) = (x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q),$$

if $(x_1, \ldots, x_n;\ q)$ is the final configuration.

Let one name the vector function $\tilde{F}$ of the type (2.1) *simple* one if there exist integer (not necessarily $\mathbb{N}_0$) numbers $a_1, \ldots, a_k$, as well as $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ $(i \leqslant k)$ and $q', q'' \in \{0, 1, \ldots, s-1\}$ such that for any vector $(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q)$ it satisfies

$$\tilde{F}(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q) = \begin{cases} (x_1 + a_1, \ldots, x_k + a_k;\ q'), \text{ if } x_i = 0 \text{ and } q = q'', \\ (x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q) \text{ else} \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

(one can assume that $x_0 = 0$).

Obviously the following is true.

Statement 2.2.1. *For any reduced k-tape Minsky machine M there exist numbers $s, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and simple vector functions $\tilde{F}_1, \ldots, \tilde{F}_m$ of the type (2.1) such that*

$$\mathrm{Con}_M(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{F}_1(\tilde{F}_2(\ldots \tilde{F}_m(\tilde{x}) \ldots)).$$

The number $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$ one calls $(w; l)$*-code* of the configaration $(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q)$, if binary digits of the number x from $l \cdot (i-1)$-th up to $(l \cdot i - 1)$-th generate binary notation x_i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant k)$ and the digits from kl-th up to $(kl + w - 1)$-th have the binary notation of the number q. One can note that $(w; l)$-code of the configuration is not unique.

Everywhere defined function $f(x)$ will be called *simplistic* if there exist $u, v \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for all x it satisfies

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} x + v, \text{ if } x \wedge u = 0, \\ x \text{ else.} \end{cases}$$

Statement 2.2.2. *Let* $\tilde{F}$ *be a simple vector function of the type* (2.1), $w, l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *be such numbers that* $2^w \geqslant s$ *and* $l \geqslant 1$. *Then there exist such simplistic functions* f_1, f_2, f_3, *that for any vector* $(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q)$, $(y_1, \ldots, y_k;\ q^*)$ *and a number* $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$, *if*

$$\begin{aligned}
&x_1, \ldots, x_k, y_1, \ldots, y_k < 2^l,\\
&(y_1, \ldots, y_k;\ q^*) = \tilde{F}(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q),\\
&x \text{ is } (w; l)\text{-code of configuration } (x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q),
\end{aligned}$$

then $f_3(f_2(f_1(x)))$ *is* $(w; l)$*-code of configuration* $(y_1, \ldots, y_k;\ q^*)$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{F}$ have the form (2.4). Then one can assume

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_1 = 0,\\
&v_1 = (2^w - q'') \cdot 2^{lk},\\
&u_2 = \begin{cases} (2^w - 1) \cdot 2^{lk} + (2^l - 1) \cdot 2^{l\cdot(i-1)}, & \text{if } i > 0,\\ (2^w - 1) \cdot 2^{lk}, & \text{if } i = 0, \end{cases}\\
&v_2 = 2^{lk+w} + (2^w + q' - q'') \cdot 2^{lk} + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j \cdot 2^{l\cdot(j-1)},\\
&u_3 = 0,\\
&v_3 = q'' \cdot 2^{lk},\\
&f_j(x) = \begin{cases} x + v_j, & \text{if } x \wedge u_j = 0,\\ x & \text{else} \end{cases}\\
&(1 \leqslant j \leqslant 3).
\end{aligned}$$

To begin with one can notice that for all j $(1 \leqslant j \leqslant 3)$ the numbers u_j, v_j are non-negative.

Let $f_1(x)$, $f_2(f_1(x))$, $f_3(f_2(f_1(x)))$ be the codes of the configurations K_1, K_2, K_3 respectively. And let

$$K_j = (x_{j1}, \ldots, x_{jk};\ q_j), \quad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant 3.$$

Obviously $f_1(x) = x + (2^w - q'') \cdot 2^{lk}$. Thus,

$$K_1 = (x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q - q'')$$

(here and further in this proof addition and subtraction of numbers q, q', q'', q_j are performed modulus 2^w).

Further, let one prove that

$$(f_1(x) \wedge u_2 = 0) \Leftrightarrow (x_i = 0 \text{ and } q = q''). \tag{2.5}$$

For this let one consider two cases: $i > 0$ and $i = 0$. If $i > 0$, then in binary notation of the number u_2 the ones are placed in digit places from $l \cdot (i-1)$-th up to $(l \cdot i - 1)$-th and from lk-th up to $(lk + w - 1)$-th. From this it follows that $f_1(x) \wedge u_2 = 0$ if and only if the corresponding digits of the number $f_1(x)$ are zeroes. That is

$$(f_1(x) \wedge u_2 = 0) \Leftrightarrow (x_{1i} = 0 \text{ and } q_1 = 0).$$

One can notice that $q_1 = q - q''$ and $x_{1i} = x_i$, thus one obtains (2.5). In case with $i = 0$ analogous to reasonings one gets the following statement

$$(f_1(x) \wedge u_2 = 0) \Leftrightarrow (q = q'').$$

According to the assumption $x_0 = 0$, thus, it satisfies (2.5).

Let $f_1(x) \wedge u_2 = 0$, i.e. $x_i = 0$ and $q = q''$. In this case it is obvious that for all j $(1 \leqslant j \leqslant k)$ it satisfies $y_j = x_j + a_j$. By definition $f_1(x)$ is $(w; l)$-code of the configuration K_1. Thus the following equalities hold true

$$f_1(x) \equiv q_1 \cdot 2^{lk} + \Sigma_{j=1}^{k} x_{1j} \cdot 2^{l\cdot(j-1)} \equiv (q - q'') \cdot 2^{lk} + \Sigma_{j=1}^{k} x_j \cdot 2^{l\cdot(j-1)} \equiv$$
$$\equiv \Sigma_{j=1}^{k} x_j \cdot 2^{l\cdot(j-1)} \pmod{2^{lk+w}}.$$

Then

$$f_2(f_1(x)) \equiv f_1(x) + v_2 \equiv (q' - q'') \cdot 2^{lk} + \Sigma_{j=1}^{k} (x_j + a_j) \cdot 2^{l\cdot(j-1)} \equiv$$
$$\equiv (q' - q'') \cdot 2^{lk} + \Sigma_{j=1}^{k} y_j \cdot 2^{l\cdot(j-1)} \pmod{2^{lk+w}}.$$

From this and from the fact that for all j $(1 \leqslant j \leqslant k)$ it satisfies $y_j < 2^l$, one obtains that

$$K_2 = (y_1, \ldots, y_k;\ q' - q'').$$

And if $f_1(x) \wedge u_2 \neq 0$, then it is obvious that for all j $(1 \leqslant j \leqslant k)$ it satisfies $y_j = x_j$. Besides, $f_2(f_1(x)) = f_1(x)$ and

$$K_2 = K_1 = (x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q - q'') = (y_1, \ldots, y_k;\ q - q'').$$

Further, it is obvious that

$$f_3(f_2(f_1(x))) = f_2(f_1(x)) + v_3 = f_2(f_1(x)) + q'' \cdot 2^{lk}.$$

from this it follows that $q_3 = q_2 + q''$ and for all j $(1 \leqslant j \leqslant k)$ it satisfies

$$x_{3j} = x_{2j} = y_j.$$

If $x_i = 0$ and $q = q''$, then

$$q_3 = q_2 + q'' = (q' - q'') + q'' = q' = q^*.$$

Otherwise,

$$q_3 = q_2 + q'' = (q - q'') + q'' = q = q^*.$$

Thereby,

$$K_3 = (y_1, \ldots, y_k;\ q^*).$$

The statement is proved. □

Consequence. *Let M be a reduced k-tape Minsky machine. Then there exists such $w, r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that for any $l \geqslant 1$ there are simplistic functions $f_{r-1}, f_{r-2}, \ldots, f_0$ such that for any vectors $(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q)$ and $(y_1, \ldots, y_k;\ q')$ and number $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$ from conditions*

$$\begin{array}{l} x_1, \ldots, x_k, y_1, \ldots, y_k < 2^l, \\ (y_1, \ldots, y_k;\ q') = \mathrm{Con}_M(x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q), \\ x \text{ is } (w; l) - \text{code of configuration } (x_1, \ldots, x_k;\ q) \end{array}$$

it follows that $f_{r-1}(f_{r-2}(\ldots f_0(x)\ldots))$ is $(w; l)$-code of the configuration $(y_1, \ldots, y_k;\ q')$.

Note. *It is easy to see that u_j and v_j can be expressed as polynomials with integer coefficients of 2^l.*

3. Basic Property of the Function Q

Let one denote by $h_c(x)$ the number the binary notation of which is composed of c smaller digit places of the number x ($h_c(x) = 0$, if $c = 0$, $h_c(x) = x$, if the binary notation of x has less then c digits). One can note that for any x, y, c the following relation is satisfied:

$$h_c(x + y) = h_c(h_c(x) + h_c(y)).$$

Now let one formulate and prove the basic property of the function Q.

Statement 2.3.1. *Let integer non-negative numbers* $r \geqslant 1$, $u_0, \ldots, u_{r-2}$, $v_0, \ldots, v_{r-2}$ *and a sequence of everywhere defined functions* $f_0(x)$, $f_1(x)$, $\ldots$ *is such that for all* $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *it satisfies:*

$$f_i(x) = \begin{cases} \begin{cases} x + v_{\mathrm{rm}(i,r)}, & \text{if } x \wedge u_{\mathrm{rm}(i,r)} = 0, \\ x \ \text{else}, \end{cases} & \text{if } \mathrm{rm}(i,r) \neq r-1, \\ x, \ \text{if } \mathrm{rm}(i,r) = r-1. \end{cases}$$

and let it for numbers t_0, p_1, p_2, c_1, c_2, x, u_{r-1}, $v_{r-1} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *satisfy the following conditions:*

$$t_0 \geqslant 1, \tag{2.6}$$
$$u_{r-1} = 2^{c_1} - 1, \tag{2.7}$$
$$2^{c_2-1} \leqslant v_{r-1} < 2^{c_2}, \tag{2.8}$$
$$p_1 = \Sigma_{i=0}^{r-1} 2^{c_1 \cdot i} \cdot u_i, \tag{2.9}$$
$$p_2 = \Sigma_{i=0}^{r-1} 2^{c_2 \cdot i} \cdot v_i, \tag{2.10}$$
$$x + 2p_2 t_0 < 2^{c_1}, \tag{2.11}$$
$$x + t_0 \cdot \max(v_0, \ldots, v_{r-2}) < 2^{c_2}, \tag{2.12}$$
$$u_i < 2^{c_2} \ (0 \leqslant i \leqslant r-2), \tag{2.13}$$
$$c_1 \geqslant c_2, \tag{2.14}$$
$$x \geqslant 1. \tag{2.15}$$

Then $h_{c_2}(Q(x, p_1, p_2, c_1, c_2, t_0)) = f_{t_0-1}(f_{t_0-2}(\ldots f_0(x)\ldots))$.

Proof. Let

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} f_{t-1}(f_{t-2}(\ldots f_0(x)\ldots)), \ \text{if } t > 0, \\ x, \ \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases}$$

Obviously for all t it satisfies $g(t+1) \leqslant g(t) + \max(v_0, \ldots, v_{r-2})$. As a consequence of that, (2.12) and (2.15) one can note that for $t \leqslant t_0$ it satisfies

$$0 < g(t) < 2^{c_2}. \tag{2.16}$$

Besides, obviously for $t < t_0$ it satisfies

$$g(t) + \max(v_0, \ldots, v_{r-2}) < 2^{c_2}. \tag{2.17}$$

Further, by induction one can prove that for all $t \leqslant t_0$ it holds that

$$h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t)) = g(t).$$

Induction basis:

$$h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, 0)) = x.$$

This is correct, because

$$Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, 0) = x$$

and $x < 2^{c_2}$ (see (2.12)).

Induction step: let $t < t_0$ and

$$h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t)) = g(t).$$

One can prove that

$$h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t+1)) = g(t+1).$$

From (2.6) and (2.12) it follows that $v_0,\, \ldots,\, v_{r-2} < 2^{c_2}$, and from (2.8) it follows the fact that $v_{r-1} < 2^{c_2}$. Analogously, from (2.13) and (2.7) it follows that $u_0,\, \ldots,\, u_{r-1} < 2^{c_1}$. Thereby, for all j $(0 \leqslant j < r)$ it satisfies the following inequalities

$$u_j < 2^{c_1}, \quad v_j < 2^{c_2}.$$

From this and from (2.9), (2.10) it follows that the digits from $(c_1 \cdot j)$-th up to $(c_1 \cdot (j+1) - 1)$-th in binary notation of the number p_1 create binary notation of the number u_j, while digits from $(c_2 \cdot j)$-th up to $(c_2 \cdot (j+1) - 1)$-th in binary notation of the number p_2 form the binary notation of v_j $(0 \leqslant j < r)$. In its turn the relations (2.7) and (2.8) show that the binary notation of numbers p_1 and p_2 have $c_1 \cdot r$ and $c_2 \cdot r$ digits respectively. From this one can conclude that for any $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the following inequalities are satisfied:

$$h_{c_1}(R(p_1,\, c_1 \cdot t)) = u_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)}, \tag{2.18}$$

$$h_{c_2}(R(p_2,\, c_2 \cdot t)) = v_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)}. \tag{2.19}$$

Using definiton of the function Q and (2.11) one can notice that

$$Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \leqslant x + 2p_2 t \leqslant x + 2p_2 t_0 < 2^{c_1}.$$

Thus, if $\mathrm{rm}(t,r) \neq r-1,$ then

$$Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \wedge R(p_1,\, c_1 \cdot t) = Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \wedge h_{c_1}(R(p_1,\, c_1 \cdot t)) = \\ = Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \wedge u_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)}.$$

From the induction proposal and from (2.13) it follows that

$$Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \wedge u_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)} = g(t) \wedge u_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)}.$$

Thereby, if $\mathrm{rm}(t,r) \neq r-1,$ then

$$Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \wedge R(p_1,\, c_1 \cdot t) = g(t) \wedge u_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)}. \tag{2.20}$$

If $\mathrm{rm}(t,r) = r-1,$ then

$$h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t)) \wedge h_{c_2}(R(p_1,\, c_1 \cdot t)) = \\ = h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t)) \wedge h_{c_2}(h_{c_1}(R(p_1,\, c_1 \cdot t))) = \\ = g(t) \wedge h_{c_2}(u_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)}) = g(t) \wedge h_{c_2}(u_{r-1}) = \\ g(t) \wedge h_{c_2}(2^{c_1}-1) = g(t) \wedge (2^{c_2}-1) \neq 0.$$

Here the first inequality follows from (2.14), the second one from the inductive proposal and (2.18), the third one from the fact that $\mathrm{rm}(t,r) = r-1,$ the forth one from (2.7), the fifth comes from (2.14) and the last inequality comes from (2.16). Consequently, if $\mathrm{rm}(t,r) = r-1,$ then

$$Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \wedge R(p_1,\, c_1 \cdot t) \neq 0. \tag{2.21}$$

Thereby, from (2.20), (2.21) and the definition of the function Q it follows that

$$Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t+1) = \\ = \begin{cases} Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) + R(p_2,\, c_2 \cdot t), \text{ if } g(t) \wedge u_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)} = 0 \text{ and} \\ \qquad \mathrm{rm}(t,r) \neq r-1, \\ Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) \text{ else.} \end{cases}$$

One can notice that if $\mathrm{rm}(t,r) \neq r-1,$ then from the properties of function $h_{c_2},$ the inductive proposal, (2.19) and (2.17) one obtains

$$h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t) + R(p_2,\, c_2 \cdot t)) = h_{c_2}(h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t)) + \\ + h_{c_2}(R(p_2,\, c_2 \cdot t))) = h_{c_2}(g(t) + v_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)}) = g(t) + v_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)}.$$

Thereby,

$$h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t+1)) =$$

$$= \begin{cases} g(t) + v_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)}, \text{ if } g(t) \wedge u_{\mathrm{rm}(t,r)} = 0 \text{ and } \mathrm{rm}(t,r) \neq r-1, \\ g(t) \text{ else.} \end{cases}$$

Cosequently,

$$h_{c_2}(Q(x,\, p_1,\, p_2,\, c_1,\, c_2,\, t+1)) = g(t+1).$$

The statement is proved. □

4. Proof of Theorem 4

Let one notate the closure of the system (6) by Φ. One can note that

$$0 = x \div x, \quad x + y = (x+1) \cdot (y+1) \div (xy+1).$$

Consequently, all polynomials with integer coeffcients that take integer non-negative values in arrays of integer non-negative numbers belong to Φ.

Let $f(y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathcal{E}^2$. Then according to the consequence from the statement 2.1.1 there exists a reduced Minsky machine M and a polynomial $t(\tilde{y})$ with coefficients from $\mathbb{N}_0$ such that M calculates f and for any array $\tilde{y}$ it holds that

$$T_M(\tilde{y}) \leqslant t(\tilde{y}).$$

Let M has k tapes. One can assume that for any $\tilde{y}$ it satisfies $t(\tilde{y}) \geqslant 1$.

Further one can choose $w,\, r' \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that for the machine M there holds all conditions of the consequence from the statement 2.2.2. Let

$$m(\tilde{y}) = t(\tilde{y}) + \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} y_i.$$

It is obvious that $m(\tilde{y}) \in \Phi$. One can notice at the beginning $t(\tilde{y})$ steps of the Minsky machine M execution at the entrance array $\tilde{y}$ the heads will be positioned at the cells with numbers not exceeding $m(\tilde{y})$. Let

$$l(\tilde{y}) = [\log_2 m(\tilde{y})] + 1.$$

Then obviously for any $\tilde{y}$ it holds that

$$m(\tilde{y}) < 2^{l(\tilde{y})}.$$

It is obvious that if $(y'_1, \ldots, y'_k;\ q')$ is some configuration of the Minsky machine M at the time $t' \leqslant t(\tilde{y})$ that is initiated at the entrance array $\tilde{y}$ at the moment 0, then it satisfies

$$y'_1, \ldots, y'_n < 2^{l(\tilde{y})}.$$

Then according to the consequence from the statement 2.2.2 and remarks to it there exist functions $u_0(\tilde{y}), \ldots, u_{r'-1}(\tilde{y}), v_0(\tilde{y}), \ldots, v_{r'-1}(\tilde{y})$ that can be expressed as polynomials of $2^{l(\tilde{y})}$ with integer coefficients such that for any $\tilde{y}$ it holds that if σ is $(w;\ l(\tilde{y}))$–code of the initial configuration $(y_1, \ldots, y_n, 0, \ldots, 0;\ 1)$ of the Minsky machine M and if

$$f_{i,\tilde{y}}(\sigma) = \begin{cases} \sigma + v_i(\tilde{y}), \text{ if } \sigma \wedge u_i(\tilde{y}) = 0, \\ \sigma \text{ else,} \end{cases} \qquad (0 \leqslant i < r')$$
$$\phi_{\tilde{y}}(\sigma) = f_{r'-1,\tilde{y}}(f_{r'-2,\tilde{y}}(\ldots f_{0,\tilde{y}}(\sigma)\ldots)),$$
$$\psi_{\tilde{y}}(\sigma) = \underbrace{\phi_{\tilde{y}}(\phi_{\tilde{y}}(\ldots\phi_{\tilde{y}}(\sigma)\ldots))}_{t(\tilde{y})\text{ times}},$$

then $\psi_{\tilde{y}}(\sigma)$ is $(w;\ l(\tilde{y}))$-code of the machine M configuration at the time $t(\tilde{y})$, i.e. the code of the final configuration. Here $\phi_{\tilde{y}}(\sigma)$ is the transformation of the code of the Minsky machine M configuration over the course of one step.

It is obvious that

$$2^{l(\tilde{y})} = \min(2 \cdot m(\tilde{y}), 2^{l(\tilde{y})}) \in \Phi.$$

Consequently,

$$u_0(\tilde{y}), \ldots, u_{r'-1}(\tilde{y}),\ v_0(\tilde{y}), \ldots, v_{r'-1}(\tilde{y}) \in \Phi.$$

Let

$$x(\tilde{y}) = (2^w + 1) \cdot (2^{l(\tilde{y})})^k + \Sigma_{i=1}^n (2^{l(\tilde{y})})^{i-1} \cdot y_i.$$

It is obvious that $x(\tilde{y})$ is $(w; l(\tilde{y}))$-code of the initial configuration $(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n, 0, \ldots, 0;\ 1)$ and $x(\tilde{y}) \in \Phi$.

Let

$$z(\tilde{y}) = \psi_{\tilde{y}}(x(\tilde{y})).$$

Further, one can define functions $u_{r'}(\tilde{y})$, $v_{r'}(\tilde{y})$, $p_1(\tilde{y})$, $p_2(\tilde{y})$, $c_1(\tilde{y})$, $c_2(\tilde{y})$, $t'(\tilde{y})$ in the following way:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&t'(\tilde{y}) = t(\tilde{y}) \cdot (r'+1),\\
&c_2(\tilde{y}) = \left[\log_2(x(\tilde{y}) + \Sigma_{i=0}^{r'-1} u_i(\tilde{y}) + t'(\tilde{y}) \cdot \Sigma_{i=0}^{r'-1} v_i(\tilde{y}))\right] + 1,\\
&v_{r'}(\tilde{y}) = 2^{c_2(\tilde{y})-1},\\
&p_2(\tilde{y}) = \Sigma_{i=0}^{r'} (2^{c_2(\tilde{y})})^i \cdot v_i(\tilde{y}),\\
&c_1(\tilde{y}) = [\log_2(x(\tilde{y}) + 2 \cdot t'(\tilde{y}) \cdot p_2(\tilde{y}))] + 1,\\
&u_{r'}(\tilde{y}) = 2^{c_1(\tilde{y})} - 1,\\
&p_1(\tilde{y}) = \Sigma_{i=0}^{r'} (2^{c_1(\tilde{y})})^i \cdot u_i(\tilde{y}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Let, furthermore, $r = r' + 1$ and $f_{r-1,\tilde{y}}(\sigma) \equiv \sigma$. Then obviously the numbers

$$r,\ u_0(\tilde{y}),\ u_1(\tilde{y}),\ \ldots,\ u_{r-2}(\tilde{y}),\ v_0(\tilde{y}),\ v_1(\tilde{y}),\ \ldots,\ v_{r-2}(\tilde{y}),$$

the sequence of functions

$$f_{0,\tilde{y}},\ f_{1,\tilde{y}},\ \ldots,\ f_{r-1,\tilde{y}}, f_{0,\tilde{y}},\ f_{1,\tilde{y}},\ \ldots,\ f_{r-1,\tilde{y}}, \ldots$$

and the numbers

$$t'(\tilde{y}),\ p_1(\tilde{y}),\ p_2(\tilde{y}),\ c_1(\tilde{y}),\ c_2(\tilde{y}),\ x(\tilde{y}),\ u_{r-1}(\tilde{y}),\ v_{r-1}(\tilde{y})$$

satisfy the conditions of the statement 2.3.1. Consequently,

$$z(\tilde{y}) = h_{c_2(\tilde{y})}(Q(x(\tilde{y}),\ p_1(\tilde{y}),\ p_2(\tilde{y}),\ c_1(\tilde{y}),\ c_2(\tilde{y}),\ t'(\tilde{y}))).$$

That is,

$$z(\tilde{y}) = \mathrm{rm}(Q(x(\tilde{y}),\ p_1(\tilde{y}),\ p_2(\tilde{y}),\ c_1(\tilde{y}),\ c_2(\tilde{y}),\ t'(\tilde{y})), 2^{c_2(\tilde{y})}).$$

It is obvious that

$$c_1(\tilde{y}),\ c_2(\tilde{y}) \in \Phi.$$

Besides

$$2^{c_2(\tilde{y})} = \min(2 \cdot (x(\tilde{y}) + \Sigma_{i=0}^{r-1} u_i(\tilde{y}) + t'(\tilde{y}) \cdot \Sigma_{i=0}^{r-1} v_i(\tilde{y})), 2^{c_2(\tilde{y})})$$

and

$$2^{c_1(\tilde{y})} = \min(2 \cdot (x(\tilde{y}) + 2 \cdot t'(\tilde{y}) \cdot p_2(\tilde{y})), 2^{c_1(\tilde{y})}),$$

Therefore,

$$2^{c_1(\tilde{y})},\ 2^{c_2(\tilde{y})} \in \Phi.$$

Consequently,

$$p_1(\tilde{y}),\ p_2(\tilde{y}),\ u_{r'}(\tilde{y}),\ v_{r'}(\tilde{y}) \in \Phi.$$

Since $z(\tilde{y})$ is $(w; l(\tilde{y}))$-code of the concluding Minsky machine M configuration, it holds that

$$f(\tilde{y}) = \mathrm{rm}(z(\tilde{y}), 2^{l(\tilde{y})}).$$

Further, one can note that

$$h(x,\ \tilde{y}) = \mathrm{rm}(\mathrm{rm}(x,\ 2^{c_2(\tilde{y})}), 2^{l(\tilde{y})}) \in \Phi$$

and

$$f(\tilde{y}) = h(Q(x(\tilde{y}),\ p_1(\tilde{y}),\ p_2(\tilde{y}),\ c_1(\tilde{y}),\ c_2(\tilde{y}),\ t'(\tilde{y})),\ \tilde{y}).$$

Theorem proved.

Chapter 3.

Finite Generability of Some Groups of Recursive Permutations

1. Definitions

The majority of definitions and notation can be looked up in sections 3.1 and 3.4 of the introduction.

For any set A that is regular in Q one fixes functions from the definition of regularity (μ and ν) and will notate them as μ_A and ν_A respectively.

For one-place functions f, g, h the notation $h = f \circ g$ denotes that $h(x) = f(g(x))$. If f is a permutation, then f^{-1} denotes a permutation inverse to f.

For the class of functions Q one denotes $Q^{(1)}$ the set of all one-place functions from Q.

Definition. The *graph* of permutation $f(x)$ is the directed graph with the set of vertexes $\mathbb{N}_0$ and the set of arrows $\{(x, f(x)) : \ x \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$.

Let

$$f^z = \begin{cases} \underbrace{f \circ \ldots \circ f}_{z \text{ times}}, \text{ if } z > 0, \\ I, \text{ if } z = 0, \\ (f^{-1})^{|z|}, \text{ if } z < 0, \end{cases}$$

where $I(x) = x$ for all x.

Definition. Permutation f is called *matching* over the set A, if $f = f^{-1}$ and for any $x \notin A$ it satisfies $f(x) = x$.

A matching over $\mathbb{N}_0$ one calls simply a matching.

Definition. *The characteristic function* of a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$ is the function $\chi_A(x)$, that is defined by the equality

$$\chi_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } x \in A, \\ 0 \text{ else.} \end{cases}$$

Definition. A permutation f is called *stationary* over a set A, if for any $x \in A$ the following equality holds $f(x) = x$.

Further one will use the contracted notation for permutations. For example the notation

$$f: \ g(y) \leftrightarrow h(y), \ y \geqslant 2, \ \ t(y) \to u(y) \to v(y) \to t(y)$$

means that

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} h(y), \text{ if } x = g(y) \text{ for some } y \geqslant 2, \\ g(y), \text{ if } x = h(y) \text{ for some } y \geqslant 2, \\ u(y), \text{ if } x = t(y) \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{N}_0, \\ v(y), \text{ if } x = u(y) \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{N}_0, \\ t(y), \text{ if } x = v(y) \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{N}_0, \\ x \text{ in other cases.} \end{cases}$$

It is noteworthy that this notation is not always correct, its correctness will be proved for every individual case aside from those in which it is obvious.

Definition. The three (f, g, B), where f, g are matchings, B is the set of vectors from $\mathbb{N}_0^4$, called *correct* if all the components of vectors from B are different (both inside those vectors and in different vectors) and the following relations are satisfied

$$f: \ b_1 \leftrightarrow b_3, \ b_2 \leftrightarrow b_4, \ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B, \tag{3.1}$$

$$g: \ b_1 \leftrightarrow b_2, \ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B.$$

Definition. A correct three (f, g, B) is called a correct one over Q if $f, g \in Q$.

It is noteworthy that, from the requirements II and IV it follows the existence in Q of numerating functions $c_n(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ mapping one-to-one $\mathbb{N}_0^n$ into $\mathbb{N}_0$ and functions inverse to them $c_{n,1}(x), \ldots, c_{n,n}(x)$ (see [3]). Further in the text there are definitions of some functions that use numerating functions, i.e. those that depend on their choice. The assumption is that if any statement mentions the class Q, satisfying the requirements II, IV, and some functions from those given below then these functions are generated based on numeration functions from the class Q (fixed for the given class).

For every function $f(x)$ let one assume the following

$$\mathrm{p}_f: \begin{array}{l} c_3(x, 2y, z) \to c_3(f(x), 2c_2(x, y), z), \\ c_3(x, 4y+1, z) \to c_3(x, 2y+1, z), \\ c_3(x, 4y+3, z) \to c_3(x, 2y, z),\ x < f(c_{2,1}(y)), \\ c_3(x, 4y+3, z) \to c_3(x+1, 2y, z),\ x \geqslant f(c_{2,1}(y)). \end{array} \tag{3.2}$$

The correctness of this definition will be proved later.

Definition. The pairwise matching $f(x)$ is called *the code* of a partially defined function $g(x_1, x_2)$, if

$$f:\ c_3(x, y, 0) \leftrightarrow c_3(x, y, g(x, y) + 2),\ g(x, y) \text{ defined.} \tag{3.3}$$

Let one label px the code of the function $g(x_1, x_2) = x_1$.

Let one assume

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{del}: \ c_3(x,2y,0) \leftrightarrow c_3(x,2y,1), \\ &\mathrm{s}_{ij}: \ 4x+i \leftrightarrow 4x+j \quad (0 \leqslant i < j < 3), \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{move}: \ & c_3(x,2y,0) \to c_3(x,2y+2,0), \\ & c_3(x,1,0) \to c_3(x,0,0), \\ & c_3(x,2y+3,0) \to c_3(x,2y+1,0), \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{place}: \ & c_3(x,0,0) \to 2x, \\ & c_3(x,y+1,0) \to 4c_2(x,y)+1, \\ & c_3(x,y,z+1) \to 4c_3(x,y,z)+3, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{swap}_1: \ & c_3(x,2y,z) \to c_3(x+2,2y,z), \ z \geqslant 2, \\ & c_3(x,2y,0) \to c_3(x,2y,0), \\ & c_3(x+2,2y+1,z) \to c_3(x,2y+1,z), \ z \geqslant 2, \\ & c_3(x,2y+1,z) \to c_3(x,2y,z), \ x \in \{0,1\}, \ z \geqslant 2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{swap}_2: \ & c_3(x,2y,z) \to c_3(z,2y,x+2), \ z \geqslant 2, \\ & c_3(x,2y,0) \to c_3(x,2y,0), \\ & c_3(x+2,2y+1,z) \to c_3(x,2y+1,z), \ z \geqslant 2, \\ & c_3(x,2y+1,z) \to c_3(x,2y,z), \ x \in \{0,1\}, \ z \geqslant 2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

2. Finite Generability of a Group $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$

Statement 3.2.1. *The definition of* p_f *is correct and* p_f *is a permutation for any function* $f(x)$. *Besides if* Q *satisfies the requirements* I, II, IV *and* $f \in Q$, *then* $\mathrm{p}_f \in \mathrm{Gr}(Q)$.

Proof. Let one prove that the definition (3.2) is correct and p_f is a permutation. Indeed it is not hard to see that i-th rule in (3.2) ($1 \leqslant i \leqslant 4$) one-to-one maps the set A_i onto B_i, where

$$A_1 = \{c_3(u,v,w): \ \mathrm{rm}(v,2) = 0\},$$

$$A_2 = \{c_3(u,v,w): \ \mathrm{rm}(v,4) = 1\},$$

$$A_3 = \{c_3(u,v,w) :\ \mathrm{rm}(v,4) = 3,\ u < f(c_{2,1}([v/4]))\},$$
$$A_4 = \{c_3(u,v,w) :\ \mathrm{rm}(v,4) = 3,\ u \geqslant f(c_{2,1}([v/4]))\},$$
$$B_1 = \{c_3(u,v,w) :\ \mathrm{rm}(v,2) = 0,\ u = f(c_{2,1}([v/2]))\},$$
$$B_2 = \{c_3(u,v,w) :\ \mathrm{rm}(v,2) = 1\},$$
$$B_3 = \{c_3(u,v,w) :\ \mathrm{rm}(v,2) = 0,\ u < f(c_{2,1}([v/2]))\},$$
$$B_4 = \{c_3(u,v,w) :\ \mathrm{rm}(v,2) = 0,\ u > f(c_{2,1}([v/2]))\}.$$

It is clear that $\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4\}$, $\{B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4\}$ are partitions of the set $\mathbb{N}_0$. From that follows the correctness of the definition and the fact that p_f is a permutation.

The fact that $\mathrm{p}_f, \mathrm{p}_f^{-1} \in Q$, is derived directly from (3.2) (see [10]). The statement is proved. □

The proofs of the statements 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 are analogous to the proof of the statement 3.2.1.

Statement 3.2.2. *The definitions of* move, place, swap_1, swap_2 *are correct and are the the definitions of permutations. Besides, if the class* Q *satisfies requirements* I, II, IV, *then these permutations belong to* $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$.

Statement 3.2.3. *If the class* Q *satisfies the requirements* I, II *and* IV, *then*

$$\mathrm{del} = \mathrm{del}^{-1} \in Q, \quad \mathrm{s}_{ij} = \mathrm{s}_{ij}^{-1} \in Q \quad (0 \leqslant i < j \leqslant 3), \quad \mathrm{px} = \mathrm{px}^{-1} \in Q.$$

Statement 3.2.4. *Let the class* Q *satisfies the requirements* I, IV. *Then any regular in* Q *set* A *can be partitioned into two regular over* Q *sets* A_1 *and* A_2.

Proof. For $i = 1, 2$ one can assume that

$$A_i = \{x :\ x \in A\ \ \mu_A(x) \equiv i - 1 \pmod 2\},$$
$$\mu_{A_i}(x) = \begin{cases} (\mu_A(x) - i + 1)/2, & x \in A_i, \\ 0\ , \end{cases}$$
$$\nu_{A_i}(x) = \nu_A(2x + i - 1).$$

From I and IV it follows that $\chi_{A_i}, \mu_{A_i}, \nu_{A_i} \in Q$ for $i = 1, 2$. It is obvious that the functions μ_{A_i}, ν_{A_i} fit the definition of regularity for A_i. Besides, it is

obvious that A_1, A_2 are infinite and create a partition of A. The statement is proved. $\square$

Statement 3.2.5. *Let the class Q satisfy the requirements* I, IV. *Then for any non-intersecting regular in Q sets A and B the set $A \cup B$ is regular in Q.*

Proof. One can assume

$$\mu(x) = \begin{cases} 2\mu_A(x), \text{ else } x \in A, \\ 2\mu_B(x) + 1, \quad x \in B, \\ 0 \text{ else}, \end{cases}$$
$$\nu(x) = \begin{cases} \nu_A(x/2), \text{ if } x \equiv 0 \pmod 2, \\ \nu_B((x-1)/2), \quad x \equiv 1 \pmod 2. \end{cases}$$

From the requirements I and IV it follows that $\mu, \nu \in Q$. It is clear that the functions μ, ν do comply with the definition of regularity for $A \cup B$, $\chi_{A \cup B} = \chi_A + \chi_B \in Q$. The statement is proved. $\square$

Statement 3.2.6. *Let the class Q satisfy the requirements* I–IV. *Then for any permutation $f \in \mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ there exist permutations $f_1, f_2 \in \mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ and sets A_1, A_2 that are regular in Q such that $\mathbb{N}_0 \backslash A_1$, $\mathbb{N}_0 \backslash A_2$ are regular in Q, $f = f_1 \circ f_2$, f_i is stationary over the set A_i ($i = 1, 2$).*

Proof. Let A, B be the sets from the requirement III for Q and f. Let one divide B into two regular in Q sets B_1, B_2 (which can be done according to the statement 3.2.4).

Let one assume that

$$f_1 : \begin{array}{l} x \to f(x), \ x \in A; \\ x \to \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,0)), \ x \notin A, f^{-1}(x) \in A; \\ \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,0)) \to x, \ x \in A, f^{-1}(x) \notin A; \\ \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,y)) \to \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,y+1)), \ x \notin A, f^{-1}(x) \in A; \\ \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,y+1)) \to \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,y)), \ x \in A, f^{-1}(x) \notin A. \end{array}$$

It is easy to show that the set of arrows of the graph of the permutation f_1 is derived from the set $\{(x, f(x)) : \ x \in A\}$ by adding for each sink vertex

x (a vertex into which an arrow enters but there is no arrow coming out of it) of the infinite chain

$$x \to \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,0)) \to \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,1)) \to \dots \ ,$$

for every source vertex x (a vertex out of which there is an out-coming arrow but no incoming one) of the infinite chain

$$\dots \to \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,1)) \to \nu_{B_1}(c_2(x,0)) \to x$$

and by adding loops (x,x) for every vertex x that has no out-coming arrow and no incoming arrow. After setting up this construction there is a graph in which there is only one out-coming and one incoming arch. From that it follows that the definition of f_1 is correct and f_1 is a permutation.

From the definition of f_1 it follows that f_1 is stationary over the set $\mathbb{N}_0\backslash(A \cup f(A) \cup B_1)$. From the requirement III for Q it follows that $(A \cup f(A)) \cap B = \varnothing$. And thus,

$$B_2 \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0\backslash(A \cup f(A) \cup B_1).$$

Thereby, it follows that f_1 is stationary over B_2.

Let $f_2 = f_1^{-1} \circ f$. From the fact that f_1 coincides with f over A (see the definition of f_1) it follows that f_2 is stationary over A.

From drawing an analogy with the statement 3.2.1 it is easy to show that $f_1, f_1^{-1} \in Q$. From that it follows that $f_2 \in Q$ and $f_2^{-1} = f^{-1} \circ f_1 \in Q$. Put $A_1 = B_2,\ A_2 = A$. It is noteworthy that the regularity $\mathbb{N}_0\backslash A_2$ in Q follows from choosing the set A, the regularity of $\mathbb{N}_0\backslash A_1 = (\mathbb{N}_0\backslash B) \cup B_1$ follows from choosing the set B, from regularity of B_1 and from statement 3.2.5. The statement is proved. □

Statement 3.2.7. *Let the class Q satisfy the requirements* I, II, IV. *Then if the permutation $f \in \mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ is stationary over some regular in Q set A such that $\mathbb{N}_0\backslash A$ also regular in Q, then there exists such correct in Q triplets $(f_1, g_1, B_1), \dots, (f_k, g_k, B_k)$ that*

$$f = f_1 \circ \dots \circ f_k.$$

Proof. By using *twice* the statement 3.2.4, let one divide the set A into regular in Q sets $A_1,\ A_2,\ A_3$.

Let one introduce auxiliary functions c' c'', mapping $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{N}_0$ ($\mathbb{Z}$ is the set of all integer numbers):

$$c'(x,z) = \begin{cases} \nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}(x), \text{ if } z = 0, \\ \nu_{A_1}(x), \text{ if } z = 1, \\ \nu_{A_3}(c_2(x, z-2)), \text{ if } z > 1, \\ \nu_{A_2}(c_2(x, -z-1)), \text{ if } z < 0, \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

$$c''(x,z) = \begin{cases} c'(x,z), \text{ if } z \leqslant 0, \\ c'(\mu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A} \circ f \circ \nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}(x), z), \text{ if } z > 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

It is clear that the mapping c' is one-to-one. Besides, it is clear that f one-to-one maps $\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A$ to $\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A$ (because f is stationary over A). Thus, $\mu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A} \circ f \circ \nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}$ is a permutation ($\nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}$ that is a one-to-one mapping of $\mathbb{N}_0$ onto $\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A$, f — $\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A$ onto $\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A$, and $\mu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}$ — $\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A$ onto $\mathbb{N}_0$). Thus, it follows that c'' is as well one-to-one. Put

$$r_1 : \ c''(x,z) \leftrightarrow c''(x, 1-z), \ z \in \mathbb{Z},$$

$$r_2 : \ c''(x,z) \leftrightarrow c''(x, -z), \ z \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The permutations h_1, h_2 is defined with the help of the same formulas with a replacement of c'' to c'. Let one remark that r_1, r_2, h_1, h_2 are matchings that belong to Q (this is proved analogously to the statement 3.2.1).

Let one assume

$$r = r_1 \circ r_2, \quad h = h_1 \circ h_2.$$

It is easy to check that

$$r : \ c''(x,z) \to c''(x, z+1), \tag{3.11}$$

$$h : \ c'(x,z) \to c'(x, z+1). \tag{3.12}$$

From (3.10), (3.11) and from the fact that $\mu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A} \circ f \circ \nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}$ is a permutation it follows that the set of the arrows of the graph of the permutation r is the union of all infinite chains of the form

$$\begin{array}{l} \ldots \to c'(x,-1) \to c'(x,0), \\ c'(x,1) \to c'(x,2) \to \ldots \end{array} \qquad (x \in \mathbb{N}_0)$$

and the set $\{(c'(x,0), c'(\mu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}\circ f\circ\nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}(x),1)) :\ x\in\mathbb{N}_0\}$. On the other hand, from (3.12) it follows that the set of all arrows of the graph of the permutation h is a union of non-intersecting infinite chains of the form

$$\ldots\to c'(x,-1)\to c'(x,0)\to c'(x,1)\to\ldots\quad (x\in\mathbb{N}_0).$$

From this is follows that r and h coincide on the set

$$\{c'(x,z):\ z\in\mathbb{Z},\ z\neq 0\}=A$$

(see (3.9)). From this one can conclude that $h^{-1}\circ g$ is stationary on A.

Further for any $x\in\mathbb{N}_0$ the following equalities hold

$$r(c'(x,0))=r(c''(x,0))=c''(x,1)=c'(\mu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}\circ f\circ\nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}(x),1) \qquad (3.13)$$

(the equalities follow from (3.10), (3.11), (3.10) respectively). Furthermore, one has

$$h^{-1}\circ r\circ\nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}(x)=h^{-1}\circ r(c'(x,0))=h^{-1}(c'(\mu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}\circ f\circ\nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}(x),1))=$$

$$=c'(\mu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}\circ f\circ\nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}(x),0)=\nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}\circ\mu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}\circ f\circ\nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}(x)=f\circ\nu_{\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A}(x).$$

(first equality through the forth one follow from (3.9), (3.13), (3.12), (3.9) respectively). Thereby, $h^{-1}\circ r$ and f coincide over $\mathbb{N}_0\setminus A$. Considering that f and $h^{-1}\circ r$ are stationary at A, the following holds

$$f=h^{-1}\circ r=h_2\circ h_1\circ r_1\circ r_2.$$

Let there be

$$s_1:\ c'(x,-2y)\leftrightarrow c'(x,-2y-1),\ y\geqslant 0,$$

$$s_2:\ c'(x,-2y-1)\leftrightarrow c'(x,-2y-2),\ y\geqslant 0,$$

$$M_1=\{(c'(x,-2y),c'(x,-2y-1),c'(x,2y+1),c'(x,2y+2)),\ y\geqslant 0\},$$

$$M_2=\{(c'(x,-2y-1),c'(x,-2y-2),c'(x,2y+1),c'(x,2y+2)),\ y\geqslant 0\}.$$

Obviously s_1, s_2 are machings in Q. Thus, it is easy to notice that (r_1,s_1,M_1), (r_2,s_2,M_2), (h_1,s_1,M_1), (h_2,s_2,M_2) are correct in Q threesomes. The statement is proved. □

Theorem 9. *Let the class Q satisfy the requirements* I–IV. *Then for any permutation $f \in \mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ there exist the correct in Q threesomes $(f_1, g_1, B_1), \ldots, (f_k, g_k, B_k)$ such that*

$$f = f_1 \circ \ldots \circ f_k.$$

Proof. Using the statement 3.2.6 let one represent f in the form of compositions of permutations that are in Q together with the permutations reverse to them, stationary in some sets, regular together with their complements. Then using the statement 3.2.7 let one represent each of these permutations in the form of compositions of matchings having the corresponding correct in Q threesomes. Theorem proved. □

Statement 3.2.8. *Let the permutation f be correctly defined by the formula*

$$f:\ g_1(\tilde{x_1}) \to h_1(\tilde{x_1}),\ \rho_1(\tilde{x_1})\ \textit{is true},\ \ldots,\ g_n(\tilde{x_n}) \to h_n(\tilde{x_n}),\ \rho_n(\tilde{x_n})\ \textit{is true},$$

where g_i, h_i are some functions, ρ_i are some predicates ($1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$). Besides, let p be some permutation. Then it holds that

$$p \circ f \circ p^{-1}:\ \begin{array}{l} p(g_1(\tilde{x_1})) \to p(h_1(\tilde{x_1})),\ \rho_1(\tilde{x_1})\ \textit{true}, \\ \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots, \\ p(g_n(\tilde{x_n})) \to p(h_n(\tilde{x_n})),\ \rho_n(\tilde{x_n})\ \textit{true}. \end{array}$$

Proof. One can be convinced by checking. □

Statement 3.2.9. *Let $g(x, y)$ be a partially defined function and f is a permutation that is its code. Besides, let $(h_1(x, y), h_2(x, y))$ be a permutation on the set $\mathbb{N}_0^2$, p is a permutation that is defined by the formula*

$$p:\ c_3(x, y, z) \to c_3(h_1(x, y), h_2(x, y), z).$$

Then $p^{-1} \circ f \circ p$ is a code of the function $g(h_1(x, y), h_2(x, y))$.

Proof. Let (h_1', h_2') be an inverse permutation to (h_1, h_2) (i.e. $h_1'(h_1(x, y), h_2(x, y)) = x$, $h_2'(h_1(x, y), h_2(x, y)) = y$ for any x, y). It is clear that

$$p^{-1}:\ c_3(x, y, z) \to c_3(h_1'(x, y), h_2'(x, y), z).$$

By using the statement 3.2.8, one gets

$$p^{-1} \circ f \circ p:\ c_3(h_1'(x, y), h_2'(x, y), 0) \leftrightarrow c_3(h_1'(x, y), h_2'(x, y), g(x, y) + 2),$$

$$g(x,y) \text{ defined.}$$

Considering the fact that (h'_1, h'_2) is a permutation one can make the following substitution $z = h'_1(x,y),\ t = h'_2(x,y)$:

$$p^{-1} \circ f \circ p:\ c_3(z,t,0) \leftrightarrow c_3(z,t,g(h_1(z,t),h_2(z,t))+2),$$

$$g(h_1(z,t),h_2(z,t)) \text{ defined.}$$

The statement proved. □

Statement 3.2.10. *Let there be some functions $f(x), g(x)$, $r(x_1,x_2)$ is a function, in which for any x,y it holds that*

$$r(x,2y) = f(x),$$

s is a permutation that is a code of r. Then $\mathrm{p}_g^{-1} \circ s \circ \mathrm{p}_g$ is a permutation that is the code of such function $q(x_1,x_2)$, that

$$q(x,2y) = f(g(x)).$$

Proof. From the definition of permutation p_g (see (3.2)) it follows that

$$\mathrm{p}_g:\ c_3(x,y,z) \to c_3(h_1(x,y),h_2(x,y),z),$$

where (h_1,h_2) is a permutation on the $\mathbb{N}_0^2$, such that for any x,y it holds that

$$h_1(x,2y) = g(x), \quad h_2(x,2y) = 2c_2(x,y).$$

(the equalities follow from the first rule in (3.2)). Using the statement 3.2.9, one gets

$$q(x,2y) = r(h_1(x,2y),h_2(x,2y)) = r(g(x),2c_2(x,y)) = f(g(x)).$$

The statement is proved. □

Statement 3.2.11. *Let $f_1(x),\ldots,f_n(x)$ be such functions that*

$$f = f_1 \circ \ldots \circ f_n,$$

$$p = \mathrm{p}_{f_n}^{-1} \circ \ldots \mathrm{p}_{f_1}^{-1} \circ \mathrm{px} \circ \mathrm{p}_{f_1} \circ \ldots \circ \mathrm{p}_{f_n}.$$

Then p is the code of the function $g(x,y)$ such that for any x,y it satisfies

$$g(x,2y) = f(x).$$

Proof. By definition the permutation px is the code of the function $p'(x,y) = x$, thus for any x and y it holds that $p'(x,2y) = x$. Thereby, by applying n times the statement 3.2.10, one obtains the statement that is being proved. □

Statement 3.2.12. *Let f_1, f_2 be matchings, $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$. Besides, let it satisfy the following conditions:*

1. *A, $f_1(A)$ and $f_2(A)$ do not intersect pairwise;*
2. *f_1 stationary at $f_2(A)$;*
3. *f_2 stationary at $\mathbb{N}_0 \backslash (A \cup f_2(A))$.*

Then

$$(f_1 \circ f_2)^4 \circ f_2 : \ x \leftrightarrow f_1(x), \ x \in A.$$

Proof. It is clear that the set of all arrows (excluding loops) of the graph of the permutation f_1 consist of pairs of arrows of the form $x \leftrightarrow f_1(x)$, $x \in A$ and some other pairs of the arrows of the form $x \leftrightarrow y$, where $x, y \notin A \cup f_1(A) \cup f_2(A)$. An analogous set for f_2 consists of only of pairs of arrows $x \leftrightarrow f_2(x)$ $(x \in A)$. From this with the consideration of the condition 1 it follows that the graph of the permutation $f_1 \circ f_2$ consist of non-intersecting cycles of length 3 of the form $x \to f_2(x) \to f_1(x) \to x$ $(x \in A)$, cycles of the length 2 of the form $x \leftrightarrow f_1(x)$ $(x, f_1(x) \notin A \cup f_1(A) \cup f_2(A))$ and loops. After raising to the 4-th power the cycles of length 3 and loops remain at their place, cycles of length 2 turn into pairs of loops. After multiplying the result by f_2 cycles of length 3 transform into cycles of lengths 2 of the form $x \leftrightarrow f_1(x)$ $(x \in A)$ and loops $f_2(x) \to f_2(x)$ $(x \in A)$, all the rest remains at its place. The statement is proved. □

Statement 3.2.13. *If f is a permutation, which is the code of everywhere defined function $g(x_1, x_2)$, then $(f \circ \mathrm{del})^4 \circ \mathrm{del}$ is the code of a partially defined function $g'(x_1, x_2)$, where*

$$g'(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} g(x_1, x_2), \ \textit{if } x_2 \textit{ is even,} \\ \textit{undefined otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $A = \{c_3(x, 2y, 0),\ x, y \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. From (3.3) and (3.4) it follows that

$$f(A) \subseteq \{c_3(x, 2y, z) :\ z \geqslant 2\},$$

$$\mathrm{del}(A) = \{c_3(x, 2y, 1) :\ x, y \in \mathbb{N}_0\}.$$

Thereby, A, $f(A)$, $\mathrm{del}(A)$ are pairwise non-intersecting. Besides, it is easy to check that f is stationary at $\{c_3(x, 2y, 1) :\ x, y \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$, and del is at $\{c_3(x, 2y, z) :\ z \geqslant 2\}$. Thereby, it satisfies all of the conditions of the claim 3.2.12 for the set A and the functions f, del. From that it follows that

$$(f \circ \mathrm{del})^4 \circ \mathrm{del} :\ x \leftrightarrow f(x),\ x \in A.$$

This can be rewritten in the following way

$$(f \circ \mathrm{del})^4 \circ \mathrm{del} :\ c_3(x, 2y, 0) \leftrightarrow c_3(x, 2y, g(x, 2y) + 2).$$

The statement is proved. □

Statement 3.2.14. *Let the class Q satisfies the requirements* I, II, IV*,*

$$Q^{(1)} = [\{q_1, \ldots, q_n\}].$$

Then any matching over the set of all even numbers $f \in Q$ can be expressed in terms of compositions of permutations $\mathrm{p}_{q_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{p}_{q_n}$, px, swap_1, swap_2, move, place, del *and reverse to it.*

Proof. Let

$$f'(x) = f(2x)/2. \tag{3.14}$$

It is obvious that $f'(x)$ is a matching that belongs to Q. Let there be

$$f' = r_1 \circ \ldots \circ r_k,$$

where $r_1, \ldots, r_k \in \{q_1, \ldots, q_n\}$. Let there be

$$\psi = \mathrm{p}_{r_k}^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ \mathrm{p}_{r_1}^{-1} \circ \mathrm{px} \circ \mathrm{p}_{r_1} \circ \ldots \circ \mathrm{p}_{r_k}.$$

From the statement 3.2.11 it follows that ψ is the code of a function $g(x, y)$, and further, for any x and y it satisfies

$$g(x, 2y) = f'(x). \tag{3.15}$$

Let one assume

$$\psi_1 = (\psi \circ \mathrm{del})^4 \circ \mathrm{del}.$$

From the statement 3.2.13 and (3.15) it follows that ψ_1 is the code of a partially defined function $g'(x, y)$, that is being defined by the equality

$$g'(x,y) = \begin{cases} f'(x), \text{ if } y \text{ is even,} \\ \text{undefined otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From this it follows that

$$\psi_1 : \ c_3(x, 2y, 0) \leftrightarrow c_3(x, 2y, f'(x) + 2). \tag{3.16}$$

Let

$$\psi_2 = \mathrm{swap}_1 \circ \psi_1 \circ {\mathrm{swap}_1}^{-1}, \quad \psi_3 = \mathrm{swap}_2 \circ \psi_1 \circ {\mathrm{swap}_2}^{-1}.$$

From the first two rules in the formulas (3.7) and (3.8), from (3.16) and from the statement 3.2.8 it follows that

$$\psi_2 : \ c_3(x, 2y, 0) \leftrightarrow c_3(x + 2, 2y, f'(x) + 2), \tag{3.17}$$

$$\psi_3 : \ c_3(x, 2y, 0) \leftrightarrow c_3(f'(x) + 2, 2y, x + 2). \tag{3.18}$$

Minding the fact that f' is a matching, let one substitute $u = f'(x)$ and rewrite (3.18) in terms of

$$\psi_3 : \ c_3(f'(u), 2y, 0) \leftrightarrow c_3(u + 2, 2y, f'(u) + 2). \tag{3.19}$$

Let

$$\psi_4 = \psi_3 \circ \psi_2.$$

From (3.17), (3.19) and the fact that f' is a matching it follows that

$$\begin{gathered} \psi_4 : \ c_3(x, 2y, 0) \leftrightarrow c_3(f'(x), 2y, 0); \\ c_3(x + 2, 2y, f'(x) + 2) \leftrightarrow c_3(f'(x) + 2, 2y, x + 2). \end{gathered} \tag{3.20}$$

Let

$$\psi_5 = \mathrm{move} \circ \psi_4 \circ \mathrm{move}^{-1}.$$

From (3.5), (3.20) and the statement 3.2.8 it follows that

$$\begin{gathered} \psi_5 : \ c_3(x, 2y, 0) \leftrightarrow c_3(f'(x), 2y, 0), \ y > 0; \\ c_3(x + 2, 2y, f'(x) + 2) \leftrightarrow c_3(f'(x) + 2, 2y, x + 2). \end{gathered} \tag{3.21}$$

One can assume

$$\psi_6 :\ c_3(x,0,0) \leftrightarrow c_3(f'(x),0,0). \tag{3.22}$$

From (3.20), (3.21) and $\psi_5 = \psi_5^{-1}$ it follows that

$$\psi_6 = \psi_5 \circ \psi_4.$$

From the first rule in (3.6), from (3.22) and from the statement 3.2.8 it follows that

$$\text{place} \circ \psi_6 \circ \text{place}^{-1} :\ 2x \leftrightarrow 2f'(x).$$

From this and from the fact that (3.14) it follows that

$$f = \text{place} \circ \psi_6 \circ \text{place}^{-1}.$$

The statement is proved. □

Theorem 10. *Let class Q satisfy all of the requirements* I–IV*,*

$$Q^{(1)} = [\{q_1, \ldots, q_n\}].$$

Then any permutation $f \in \text{Gr}(Q)$ can be expressed in terms of compositions of permutations $\text{p}_{q_1}, \ldots, \text{p}_{q_n}$, px, swap_1, swap_2, move, place, del, s_{01}, s_{02}, s_{03}, s_{12}, s_{13}, s_{23} *and their inverses.*

Proof. According to the theorem 9 one can contend that f is a matching.

Let there be

$$f_{ij} :\ x \leftrightarrow f(x),\ x \equiv i \pmod 4,\ f(x) \equiv j \pmod 4, \quad 0 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant 3.$$

It is obvious that f_{ij} is a matching, $f = f_{00} \circ f_{01} \circ \ldots \circ f_{33}$.

Obviously for any i, j $(0 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant 3)$ there exists a permutation q_{ij}, that can be expressed in terms of composition of permutations s_{01}, s_{02}, s_{03}, s_{12}, s_{13}, s_{23}, that maps the set $\{x :\ \text{rm}(x,4) \in \{i,j\}\}$ into a subset of the set of all even numbers (one can notice that q_{ij}^{-1} can also be expressed in terms of the composition of these permutations). Let

$$f'_{ij} = q_{ij} \circ f_{ij} \circ q_{ij}^{-1} \quad (0 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant 3).$$

From the statement 3.2.8 and the fact that f_{ij} is a matching over the set $\{x :\ \text{rm}(x,4) \in \{i,j\}\}$ it follows that f'_{ij} is a matching over the set of all even

numbers. Therefore, for any i, j $(0 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant 3)$ f'_{ij} it can be expressed in terms of the composition of permutations from the conditions of the theorem (statement 3.2.14). From the fact that

$$f_{ij} = q_{ij}^{-1} \circ f'_{ij} \circ q_{ij} \quad (0 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant 3),$$

follows the claim of the theorem. □

Consequence. *If the class Q satisfies the requirements* I–III, V*, then the group* $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ *is finitely generated.*

Proof. Indeed, from [4] is known that from the requirements I, II, V follows the existence of the finite basis with respect to superpositioning in $Q^{(1)}$. Further applying the theorem 10. □

3. Generatability of a Group $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ by Using Two Permutations

Statement 3.3.1. *Let class Q satisfy the requirements* I, IV*. Besides let A, B, C be non-intersecting sets, B is regular in Q. Then any permutation $f \in Q$, that is a matching over the set $A \cup B \cup C$, can be expressed in terms of compositions of permutations from Q, when each of them is a matching over the set $A \cup B$ or $B \cup C$.*

Proof. Let

$$f_1 : \ x \leftrightarrow f(x), \ x, f(x) \in A \cup B,$$
$$f_2 : \ x \leftrightarrow f(x), \ x \in C, f(x) \in B \cup C,$$
$$f_3 : \ x \leftrightarrow f(x), \ x \in A, f(x) \in C.$$

Obviously

$$f = f_1 \circ f_2 \circ f_3.$$

Let one assume that

$$g_1 : \ x \leftrightarrow \nu_B(x), \ x \in A, f(x) \in C,$$

$$g_2 : \ \nu_B(x) \leftrightarrow f(x), \ x \in A, f(x) \in C.$$

One can remark that $\nu_B(x)$ is injective and therefore the definitions are correct. Furthermore, it is easy to check that

$$g_2 \circ g_1 : \ x \to f(x) \to \nu_B(x) \to x, \ x \in A, f(x) \in C.$$

From this is follows that

$$g_1 \circ g_2 \circ g_1 : \ x \leftrightarrow f(x), \ x \in A, f(x) \in C.$$

Hereby, $f_3 = g_1 \circ g_2 \circ g_1$, or

$$f = f_1 \circ f_2 \circ g_1 \circ g_2 \circ g_1.$$

One can note that $f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 \in Q$. Besides, f_1, g_1 are matchings over $A \cup B$, and f_2, g_2 are matchings over $B \cup C$. The claim is proved. $\square$

Statement 3.3.2. *Let class Q satisfy the requirements* I, IV*. Besides, let $\{A_1, \ldots, A_n\}$ be the partition of the set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$ into regular over Q sets $(n \geqslant 2)$. Then any matching $f \in Q$ over the set A can be expressed in terms of compositions of permutations over Q, where each of them is a matching over the set of the type $A_i \cup A_{i+1}$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1)$.*

Proof. Let one prove this statement by inducting on n. For $n = 2$ the statement is obvious. Let $n \geqslant 3$ and the statement is proved for the values $2, \ldots, n-1$. Let one apply the statement 3.3.1 for sets A_1, $A_2 \cup \ldots \cup A_{n-1}$ and A_n (from the statement 3.2.5 it follows that these sets are regular). Thus, f can be expressed in terms of the composition of permutations from Q, each of which is a matching over the set $A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_{n-1}$ or $A_2 \cup \ldots \cup A_n$. By applying for each of these permutations and corresponding sets the inductive hypothesis, one obtains the prove for the statement. $\square$

Statement 3.3.3. *Let the matching f and the set of four dimensional vectors B with different components (inside the vectors and in different vectors) satisfy* (3.1)*. Besides, let the matchings f_1' and f_2' over the set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$ be defined by the relations*

$$f_1' : \ b_1 \leftrightarrow b_2, \ b_3 \leftrightarrow b_4, \ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B, \tag{3.23}$$

$$f_2' : \ b_1 \leftrightarrow b_3, \ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B. \tag{3.24}$$

And let f_1'', f_2'' *be the matchings over the sets* A_1'' *and* A_2'' *respectively,* A, A_1'', A_2'' *do not intersect pairwise,*

$$f_1 = f_1' \circ f_1'', \quad f_2 = f_2' \circ f_2''.$$

Then $f = (f_1 \circ f_2)^2$.

Proof. One can note that if φ, ψ are matchings over the set A_φ and A_ψ respectively, $A_\varphi \cap A_\psi = \varnothing$, then

$$\varphi \circ \psi = \psi \circ \varphi.$$

From this and from the fact that A, A_1'', A_2'' do not intersect pairwise it follows that

$$(f_1 \circ f_2)^2 = f_1' \circ f_1'' \circ f_2' \circ f_2'' \circ f_1' \circ f_1'' \circ f_2' \circ f_2'' = (f_1' \circ f_2')^2 \circ (f_1'')^2 \circ (f_2'')^2 = (f_1' \circ f_2')^2.$$

From (3.23) and (3.24) it follows that

$$f_1' \circ f_2' : \ b_1 \to b_4 \to b_3 \to b_2 \to b_1, \ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B.$$

From this it follows that

$$(f_1' \circ f_2')^2 : \ b_1 \leftrightarrow b_3, \ b_2 \leftrightarrow b_4, \ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B.$$

The right part of this formula coincides with the right part (3.1). Thereby, it is justified to claim that

$$f = (f_1' \circ f_2')^2.$$

The claim is proved. □

Let one introduce a few axillary definitions. Let class Q satisfy the requirements I–III, V. Then from the consequence of the theorem 10 it follows that there exists a finite number of permutations from $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ in terms of compositions of them one can express any permutation from $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$. From this and from the theorem 9 it follows that there exist correct in Q threesomes

$$(f_1, g_1, B_1'), \ldots, (f_n, g_n, B_n')$$

such that the set that consists of matchings

$$f_1, \ldots, f_n, \tag{3.25}$$

generates $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$.

Let one define vector-function $\delta:\ \mathbb{N}_0^4 \to \mathbb{N}_0^4$ through the equality

$$\delta(b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4) = \begin{cases} (b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4),\ \text{if } b_1 < b_2, \\ (b_2,b_1,b_4,b_3) \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For all i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant n)$ let one assume that

$$B_i = \{\delta(b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4):\ (b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4) \in B_i'\}.$$

Let one remark that $(f_1,g_1,B_1),\ldots,(f_n,g_n,B_n)$ are correct in Q threesomes. Besides,

$$B_i = \{(x,g_i(x),f_i(x),f_i(g_i(x))):\ x < g_i(x)\},\quad 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n. \tag{3.26}$$

Let one assume that

$$h_i:\ b_1 \leftrightarrow b_2,\ b_3 \leftrightarrow b_4,\ (b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4) \in B_i, \tag{3.27}$$

$$h_{i+n}:\ b_1 \leftrightarrow b_3,\ (b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4) \in B_i \tag{3.28}$$

$(1 \leqslant i \leqslant n)$. Considering that (3.26) this can be rewritten in the following way

$$h_i:\ x \leftrightarrow g_i(x),\ f_i(x) \leftrightarrow f_i(g_i(x)),\ x < g_i(x), \tag{3.29}$$

$$h_{i+n}:\ x \leftrightarrow f_i(x),\ x < g_i(x). \tag{3.30}$$

Let

$$\mathrm{rol}(x) = x - \mathrm{rm}(x,2^{2n+1}) + \mathrm{rm}(x+1,2^{2n+1}), \tag{3.31}$$

$$E_0 = \{2^{2n+1}x,\ x \in \mathbb{N}_0\}, \tag{3.32}$$

$$E_i = \mathrm{rol}^i(E_0)\quad (1 \leqslant i < 2^{2n+1}). \tag{3.33}$$

Let one remark that $\{E_0,\ldots,E_{2^{2n+1}-1}\}$ is a partition of the set $\mathbb{N}_0$. Obviously E_0 is regular in Q $(\mu_{E_0}(x) = [x/2^{2n+1}]$, if $\mathrm{rm}(x,2^{2n+1}) = 0$, $\mu_{E_0}(x) = 0$ otherwise, $\nu_{E_0}(x) = 2^{2n+1}x)$, analogously the regularity in Q for all sets E_i $(1 \leqslant i < 2^{2n+1})$ can be proved. From the statement 3.2.5 it follows that $E_0 \cup E_1$ is regular in Q.

Let one assume that

$$u_i:\ \nu_{E_0\cup E_1}(x) \to \nu_{E_0\cup E_1}(h_i(x)), \tag{3.34}$$

$$v_i = \mathrm{rol}^{2^i} \circ u_i \circ \mathrm{rol}^{-2^i} \tag{3.35}$$

$(1 \leqslant i \leqslant 2n)$,

$$\mathrm{all} = v_1 \circ \ldots \circ v_{2n}, \tag{3.36}$$

$$w_i : \ \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(x) \to \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(f_i(x)) \tag{3.37}$$

$(1 \leqslant i \leqslant n)$.

Statement 3.3.4. $\mathrm{rol}, \mathrm{rol}^{-1}, \mathrm{all} = \mathrm{all}^{-1} \in Q$.

Proof. The statement for rol and rol^{-1} follows directly from (3.31). From (3.29) and (3.30) it follows that $h_i \in Q$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant 2n)$, from this and from (3.34), (3.35), (3.36) it follows that

$$\mathrm{all} \in Q.$$

Besides from (3.29) and (3.30) it follows that h_i is a matching for any i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant 2n)$. From this and from (3.34) it follows that u_i is a matching over $E_0 \cup E_1$, from (3.35) it follows that v_i is a matching over $E_{2^i} \cup E_{2^i+1}$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant 2n)$. Thereby, $v_1, \ldots, v_{2n}$ are the matchings at pairwise non-intersecting sets. From this and from (3.36) it follows that all is a matching. Thus,

$$\mathrm{all}^{-1} = \mathrm{all} \in Q.$$

□

Statement 3.3.5. *Let $n \geqslant 1$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, for all j $(1 \leqslant j \leqslant 2n)$ the numbers α_j and β_j are being defined by the equalities*

$$\alpha_j = \mathrm{rm}(2^{2n+1} + 2^j - 2^i, 2^{2n+1}), \quad \beta_j = \mathrm{rm}(2^{2n+1} + 2^j - 2^{i+n}, 2^{2n+1}).$$

Then the numbers 0, 1, α_j, $\alpha_j + 1$ $(j \neq i)$, β_j, $\beta_j + 1$ $(j \neq i+n)$ are pairwise distinct.

Proof. Considering that all numbers α_j, β_j are even, it sufficies to say that the numbers 0, α_j $(j \neq i)$, β_j $(j \neq i+n)$ are pairwise different. Let one prove this from contradiction. Let $\alpha_j = 0$. Then $2^j \equiv 2^i \pmod{2^{2n+1}}$, i.e. $i = j$. Analogously, if $\beta_j = 0$, then $j = i + n$. If $\alpha_{j_1} = \alpha_{j_2}$, then $2^{j_1} \equiv 2^{j_2} \pmod{2^{2n+1}}$, i.e. $j_1 = j_2$. One can proceed analogously with the case $\beta_{j_1} = \beta_{j_2}$. If $\alpha_{j_1} = \beta_{j_2}$, then $2^{j_1} + 2^{i+n} \equiv 2^{j_2} + 2^i \pmod{2^{2n+1}}$, i.e.

$2^{j_1} + 2^{i+n} = 2^{j_2} + 2^i$ (because the left and the right part are between 4 and 2^{2n+1}). This equality is possible only if $j_1 = i$ and $j_2 = i+n$. The statement is proved. □

Statement 3.3.6. *Permutations* w_i $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant n)$ *can be expressed in terms of a composition of permutations* all *and* rol.

Proof. Let one fix i. Let

$$s_1 = \mathrm{rol}^{-2^i} \circ \mathrm{all} \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^i} = \mathrm{rol}^{2^{2n+1}-2^i} \circ \mathrm{all} \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^i}, \tag{3.38}$$

$$s_2 = \mathrm{rol}^{-2^{i+n}} \circ \mathrm{all} \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^{i+n}} = \mathrm{rol}^{2^{2n+1}-2^{i+n}} \circ \mathrm{all} \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^{i+n}}. \tag{3.39}$$

One has

$$s_1 = \mathrm{rol}^{-2^i} \circ v_1 \circ \ldots \circ v_{2n} \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^i} = (\mathrm{rol}^{-2^i} \circ v_1 \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^i}) \circ \ldots \circ (\mathrm{rol}^{-2^i} \circ v_{2n} \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^i}) =$$

$$= p'_1 \circ \ldots \circ p'_{2n},$$

where

$$p'_j = \mathrm{rol}^{2^j-2^i} \circ u_j \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^i-2^j} \quad (1 \leqslant j \leqslant 2n). \tag{3.40}$$

From (3.31), (3.33) the statement 3.2.8 and from the fact that u_j is a matching at $E_0 \cup E_1$, it follows that p'_j is a matching at $E_{\alpha_j} \cup E_{\alpha_j+1}$, where

$$\alpha_j = \mathrm{rm}(2^{2n+1} + 2^j - 2^i, 2^{2n+1}), \quad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant 2n.$$

Analogously,

$$s_2 = p''_1 \circ \ldots \circ p''_{2n},$$

where

$$p''_j = \mathrm{rol}^{2^j-2^{i+n}} \circ u_j \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^{i+n}-2^j} \quad (1 \leqslant j \leqslant 2n), \tag{3.41}$$

p''_j is a matching at $E_{\beta_j} \cup E_{\beta_j+1}$, where

$$\beta_j = \mathrm{rm}(2^{2n+1} + 2^j - 2^{i+n}, 2^{2n+1}), \quad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant 2n.$$

From the statement 3.3.5 it follows that the set $E_0 \cup E_1$, and all sets $E_{\alpha_j} \cup E_{\alpha_j+1}$ $(j \neq i)$, $E_{\beta_j} \cup E_{\beta_j+1}$ $(j \neq i+n)$ do not intersect pairwise. From this it follows that

$$p'_i \circ p'_j = p'_j \circ p'_i$$

for all $j \neq i$ and

$$p''_{i+n} \circ p''_j = p''_j \circ p''_{i+n}$$

for all $j \neq i+n$. From this one can conclude that

$$s_1 = p'_1 \circ \ldots \circ p'_{2n} = s'_1 \circ s''_1, \tag{3.42}$$

where

$$s'_1 = p'_i, \tag{3.43}$$
$$s''_1 = p'_1 \circ \ldots \circ p'_{i-1} \circ p'_{i+1} \circ \ldots \circ p'_{2n}.$$

Analogously,

$$s_2 = s'_2 \circ s''_2, \tag{3.44}$$

where

$$s'_2 = p''_{i+n}, \tag{3.45}$$
$$s''_2 = p''_1 \circ \ldots \circ p''_{i+n-1} \circ p''_{i+n+1} \circ \ldots \circ p''_{2n}.$$

Besides, from the fact that there is no pairwise intersection for the given sets it follows that $s''_1,\ s''_2$ are matchings.

From (3.27), (3.28), (3.34) it follows that

$$u_i :\ \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_1) \leftrightarrow \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_2),\ \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_3) \leftrightarrow \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_4),\ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B_i, \tag{3.46}$$

$$u_{i+n} :\ \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_1) \leftrightarrow \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_3),\ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B_i \tag{3.47}$$

$(1 \leqslant i \leqslant n)$. Besides, from (3.37) and from the fact that (f_i, g_i, B_i) is a correct threesome it follows that

$$w_i :\ \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_1) \leftrightarrow \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_3),\ \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_2) \leftrightarrow \nu_{E_0 \cup E_1}(b_4),\ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B_i \tag{3.48}$$

$(1 \leqslant i \leqslant n)$.

From (3.40), (3.43) it follows that

$$s'_1 = u_i, \tag{3.49}$$

from (3.41), (3.45) —

$$s'_2 = u_{i+n}. \tag{3.50}$$

One can note that s'_1, s'_2 are matchings over $E_0 \cup E_1$ (it follows from (3.34), (3.49), (3.50)), s''_1 — at $\bigcup_{j \neq i}(E_{\alpha_j} \cup E_{\alpha_j+1})$, s''_2 — at $\bigcup_{j \neq i+n}(E_{\beta_j} \cup E_{\beta_j+1})$, the

given sets don't intersect. From (3.42), (3.44), (3.46), (3.47), (3.48), (3.49), (3.50) it follows that for permutations $w_i,\ s_1,\ s_2,\ s'_1,\ s'_2,\ s''_1,\ s''_2$ (together with $f,\ f_1,\ f_2,\ f'_1,\ f'_2,\ f''_1,\ f''_2$ respectively) and the set

$$B''_i = \{(\nu_{E_0\cup E_1}(b_1), \nu_{E_0\cup E_1}(b_2), \nu_{E_0\cup E_1}(b_3), \nu_{E_0\cup E_1}(b_4)),\ (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B_i\}$$

it satisfies all of the conditions of for the statement 3.3.3. From this it follows that

$$w_i = (s_1 \circ s_2)^2.$$

One can note that s_1 and s_2 can be expressed in terms of a composition rol and all ((3.38), (3.39)). The claim is proved. □

Statement 3.3.7. *Any matching over* $E_0 \cup E_1$, *that belong to* Q, *can be expressed in terms of a composition of* rol *and* all.

Proof. Let f be the given matching. Let one assume that

$$g(x) = \mu_{E_0\cup E_1} \circ f \circ \nu_{E_0\cup E_1}(x).$$

It is obvious that g is a matching that belongs to Q. Thus, there exist $i_1, \ldots, i_k$ such that $1 \leqslant i_1, \ldots, i_k \leqslant n$ and

$$g = f_{i_1} \circ \ldots \circ f_{i_k} \tag{3.51}$$

($f_1, \ldots, f_n$ are matchings from (3.25)). It is easy to notice that there is

$$f :\ \nu_{E_0\cup E_1}(x) \to \nu_{E_0\cup E_1}(g(x)).$$

From this, (3.37) and (3.51) it follows that

$$f = w_{i_1} \circ \ldots \circ w_{i_k}.$$

From this and from the satement 3.3.6 follows the proof of the claim. □

Statement 3.3.8. *If* $0 \leqslant i < 2^{2n+1} - 1,\ f \in Q$ *is a matching over* $E_i \cup E_{i+1}$, *then* f *can be expressed as a composition* rol *and* all.

Proof. Let

$$f' = \mathrm{rol}^{-i} \circ f \circ \mathrm{rol}^{i}.$$

From (3.31), (3.32), (3.33) and the statement 3.2.8 it follows that f' is a matching over $E_0 \cup E_1$. Besides, it is obvious that

$$f = \mathrm{rol}^{i} \circ f' \circ \mathrm{rol}^{-i} = \mathrm{rol}^{i} \circ f' \circ \mathrm{rol}^{2^{2n+1}-i}.$$

From this and the statement 3.3.7 it follows that the claim is true. □

Theorem (additional notes of the theorem 5)**.** *Any permutation* $f \in \mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ *can be expressed in terms of the composition of* rol *and* all.

Proof. Indeed, from the theorem 9 it follows that f can be expressed in terms of the composition of matchings in Q, according to the statement 3.3.2 every such matching can be expressed in terms of compositions of matchings over the sets of type $E_i \cup E_{i+1}$ $(0 \leqslant i < 2^{2n+1} - 1)$, that belong to Q, due to the statement 3.3.8 each of such matchings can be expressed in terms of a composition rol, all. □

4. Finite Generability of a Group $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ for Specific Classes Q

Proof of Theorem 6. Let one consider from the start the case of the class FP. The requirements I, II for FP can be easily proved. The requirement V follows from [12]. Let one prove that it satisfies the requirement III.

Let f be a permutation, $f, f^{-1} \in \mathrm{FP}$. Let one pick the function $h(x)$ of the form $2^{[\log_2(x+20)]^n} + 2x$ $(n \geqslant 2)$ such that for any x there is

$$f(x), f^{-1}(x) < h(x).$$

Let one note that $h(x) > x$ for any x, and the function $h(x) - x$ increases. Let

$$A_i = \{x : \ h^i(0) \leqslant x < h^{i+1}(0)\}, \quad i \geqslant 0.$$

It is clear that $\{A_i\}$ is a partition of the set $\mathbb{N}_0$. Let

$$R_1 = A_0 \cup A_4 \cup A_8 \cup \ldots, \tag{3.52}$$

$$R_2 = A_2 \cup A_6 \cup A_{10} \cup \ldots.$$

If $x \in A_i$, $f(x) \in A_j$, then $x < h^{i+1}(0)$ and, therefore, $f(x) < h^{i+2}(0)$, i.e. $j \leqslant i+1$. Analogously, by noting that $x = f^{-1}(f(x))$, one obtains the result $i \leqslant j+1$, i.e. $|i-j| \leqslant 1$. From this is follows that

$$f(R_1) \cap R_2 = \varnothing.$$

Let one prove the regularity of R_1 in FP (the regularity R_2, $\mathbb{N}_0\backslash R_1$, $\mathbb{N}_0\backslash R_2$ can be proved analogously). Let

$$\mu_1(x) = \begin{cases} \text{the number of } x \text{ in the set } R_1 \\ \qquad \text{(numeration with respect to increasing starting from zero),} \\ \qquad \text{if } x \in R_1, \\ 0 \text{ else,} \end{cases}$$

$$\nu_1(x) = \text{the element of the set } R_1 \text{ with the number } x\,.$$

One can note that $h(x) > 2x$ for all x, thus to calculate values $\mu_1(x)$ and $\chi_{R_1}(x)$ it is sufficient to have $[\log_2 x] + 1$ iterations of function h. From this it obviously follows that $\mu_1, \chi_{R_1} \in \text{FP}$. Finally, one needs to prove $\nu_1 \in \text{FP}$ (for this obviously it is sufficient to prove that it is upper bounded by some function form FP).

One can remark that $A_0, A_1, \ldots$ are non-intersecting intervals in $\mathbb{N}_0$, their lengths $|A_i|$ increase with the increase of i (becasuse $h(x) - x$ increases). From this and from (3.52) it follows that for any i it satisfies

$$\mu_1(h^{4i+1}(0) - 1) + 1 \geqslant \frac{h^{4i+1}(0)}{4}.$$

From this it follows that for some x and i it holds that $\nu_1(x) = h^{4i+1}(0) - 1$, and, thus, it is true that

$$\nu_1(x) \leqslant 4x + 3.$$

Let one prove that for any x there is $\nu_1(x) < h^5(4x + 3)$. Indeed for $x < h(0) - 1$ it is obvious, for $x \geqslant h(0) - 1$ one chooses the biggest i such that $h^{4i+1}(0) - 1 \leqslant \nu_1(x)$. Let $h^{4i+1}(0) - 1 = \nu_1(x')$ Then one has

$$\nu_1(x) < h^{4i+5}(0) - 1 \leqslant h^5(h^{4i+1}(0) - 1) = h^5(\nu_1(x')) \leqslant h^5(4x' + 3) \leqslant h^5(4x + 3).$$

From this inequality it follows that $\nu_1(x) \in \text{FP}$. Thus, f, R_1 and R_2 satisfy all of those conditions from III.

Now let one consider the class FFOM. Let one prove that the sets built in the same way R_1 and R_2 can work here as well. For this it suffices to show that μ_1, μ_2, ν_1, ν_2, χ_{R_1}, χ_{R_2} belong to FFOM. The most difficult part of

the process to compute these two functions is the iteration of the function h (the remaining parts do not have any problems, see [13, 14]). One can notice that for any x it holds that

$$2^{[\log_2(x+20)]^n} > 2x + 20,$$

thus

$$[\log_2 h(h(x))] = [\log_2 h(x)]^n.$$

From that it follows that

$$h^k(x) = 2^k x + \sum_{i=1}^{k} 2^{[\log_2(x+20)]^{n^i}+k-i}.$$

Based on this representation and the results [13, 14] it is easy to prove that all the necessary functions to the class FFOM. The requirement V is proved in the section 2 of the chapter 1. The rest of those requirements are obvious (for example as a numerating function one can take a function that places binary digits of the first number into the even places, for the second number it places them onto the odd ones; although one can use the standard polynomial (Peano function) but in this case the proof that the inverse functions belong to FFOM will be harder, see [13]).

For the class FL, minding the fact that FFOM $\subseteq$ FL (see [14]), all requirements but V, can be proved in the same fashion. Let one prove the requirement V. One can notice that the system of the functions

$$0, \quad x+1, \quad x+y, \quad xy, \quad 2^{[\log_2 x]^2}, \quad U(n,x,s),$$

where $U(n,x,s)$ is the result of calculating multitape Turing machine (with no recording onto the input tape) at the input x (in binary representation) with the space restriction $[\log_2 s]$/(the number of tapes) ($U(n,x,s) = 0$, if the machine doesn't stop or there is a mistake in calculations), is the basis in FL (which can easily be proved using the method from [12]).

Now let Q be an $\mathcal{E}^2$-closed class that has a finite basis with respect to superposition (i.e. automatically satisfying the requirement V). Then obviously it contains all functions from $\mathcal{E}^2$ and, therefore, satisfies the requirements I and II (see [10]). Let one prove that it satisfies the requirement III. Indeed,

let $f(x) \in \mathrm{Gr}(Q)$. Then let one assume

$$h(x) = \max_{0 \leqslant y \leqslant x} \max(f(y), f^{-1}(y)) + 2x + 1,$$

let one define the sets R_1 and R_2 analogously to how one did it for the class FP (using just the given function h). Based on the technique from [10] it is easy to show that R_1 and R_2 satisfy the requirements III for the class Q. The theorem is proved.

Bibliography

[1] Vinogradov, A. K., Kosovskii, N. K. A Hierarchy of Diophantine representations of primitive recursive predicates (in Russian) // Vychislitelnaya tekhnika i voprosy kibernetiki. — 1975. — Vol. 12. — pp. 99–107.

[2] Garey M., Johnson D. Computers and intractability: a guide to the theory of NP-completeness. W. H. Freeman, 1979.

[3] Malcev A. I. Algorithms and recursive functions. Groningen : Wolters-Noordhoff Pub. Co., 1970, 372 p.

[4] Marchenkov S. S. Bases with Respect to Superposition in the Classes of Recursive Functions (in Russian) // Mathematical Problems of Cybernetics. Moscow: Nauka, 1991. — vol. 3. — pp. 115–139.

[5] Marchenkov, S.S., Elementary Skolem functions, Mathematical Notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1975) 17: 79. doi:10.1007/BF01093849

[6] Marchenkov S. S. Bounded Recursions // Math. Balkanica. — 1972. — Vol. 2. — pp. 124–142.

[7] Marchenkov, S.S., A superposition basis in the class of Kal'mar elementary functions, Mathematical Notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1980) 27: 161. doi:10.1007/BF01140159

[8] Marchenkov, S.S., Simple examples of bases with respect to superposition in the class of functions that are elementary in the sense of Kalmar (in Russian) // Banach Center Publications. Warsaw. — 1989. — V. 25. — S. 119–126

[9] Marchenkov, S.S., Elimination of recursion schemas in the Grzegorczyk $\mathcal{E}^2$ class, Mathematical Notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1969) 5: 336. doi:10.1007/BF01112182

[10] Marchenkov S. S. Elementary recursive functions (in Russian[1]). Moscow: MCCME, 2003. — 112.

[11] Minsky, M. Computation: Finite and Infinite Machines, Prentice Hall, 1967, 317 p.

[12] Muchnik, A. A., On two approaches to the classification of recursive functions (in Russian) // Problems of Mathematical Logic. Moscow: Mir, 1970. P. 123–138. — 432 p.

[13] E. Allender, D. A. M. Barrington, and W. Hesse Uniform Constant-Depth Threshold Circuits for division and iterated multiplication // Journal of Computers and System Sciences. — 2002. — V. 65. — P. 695–716.

[14] D. A. M. Barrington, N. Immerman, H. Straubing, On uniformity within NC^1 // Journal of Computer and System Sciences. — 1990. — V. 41. — P. 274–306.

[15] S. Bellantoni, S. Cook, New recursion-theoretic characterization of polynomial functions // Computational Complexity. — 1992. — V. 2. — P. 97–110.

[16] A. Cobham, The intrinsic computational difficulty of functions // Proceedings of the 1964 International Congress for Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science. — 1964. — P. 24–30.

[17] Church, A. An Unsolvable problem of elementary Number Theory // American Journal of Mathematics. — 1936. — N. 58. — P. 345—363.

[18] Greenlaw R., Hoover H., Ruzzo, W. Limits to parallel Computation: P-Completeness Theory. Oxford University Press, 1995. — 311 p.

[1] in English see H-A.Esbelin, M.More, Rudimentary relations and primitive recursion: A toolbox, Theoretical Computer Science 193 (1998) 129–148; Th.Skolem, Proof of some theorems on recursively enumerable sets, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic, V.3, N.2, 1962, pp. 65–74

[19] Grzegorczyk, A. Some classes of recursive functions // Rozprawy Mathematyczne. — 1953. — V. 4. — P. 1–46. (Russian. lane: The Grzegorczyk, A. Some Classes of Recursive Functions // Mathematical Logic. M.: Mir, 1970. S. 9–49. — 432 p.)

[20] Hartmanis J., Stearns R. E. On computational complexity of algorithms // Transactions of the American Mathematical Society. — 1965. — N. 5. — P. 285–306.

[21] Kalmar L. Egyszerü pelda eldönthetelen aritmetikai problemara // Matematikai es fizikai lapok. — 1943. — V. 50. — P. 1–23.

[22] S. C. Kleene General Recursive functions of natural numbers // Mathematische Annalen. — 1936. — N. 112. — p. 727–742.

[23] Mazzanti S. Plain bases for Classes of Primitive recursive functions // Mathematical Logic Quarterly. — 2002. — V. 48. — P. 93–104.

[24] Parsons Ch., Hierarchies of Primitive Recursive Functions // Zeitschr. math. Logik u. Undertaking the grundlag. Math. — 1968. — B. 14, N 4. — S. 357–376.

[25] Post, E. L. Finite Combinatorial Processes // Journal of Symbolic Logic. — 1936. — N. 1. — p. 103–105.

[26] Ritchie, R. W. Classes of predictably computable functions // Transactions of the American Mathematical Society. — 1963. — V. 106. — pp. 139–173.

[27] Rödding D. Über die von Eliminierbarkeit Definitionsschemata in der Theorie der Funktionen rekursiven // Zeitschr. math. Logik. u. Undertaking the grundlag. Math. — 1964. — B. 10, N 4. — S. 315–330.

[28] Skolem Th. A Theorem on recursively enumerable sets // Abstract of short comm. Int. Congress Math. — 1962. — Stockholm — P. 11.

[29] Skolem Th. Proof of some theorems on recursively enumerable sets // Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic. — 1962. — V. 3, N 2. — P. 65–74.

[30] A. Turing On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungs-problem // Proceedings of The London Mathematical Society. — 1936. — Ser. 2., N. 42. — P. 230—265.

[31] C. Wrathall Rudimentary predicates and relative computation // SIAM Journal on Computing. — V. 7(2) — 1978. — P. 194–209.

the author's Work on the subject thesis

[32] Volkov S. A. Finite generability of some groups of recursive permutations // Discrete Mathematics and Applications. — 2008. — Vol. 18, issue. 6. — pp. 607–624, DOI: 10.1515/DMA.2008.046

[33] Volkov S. A. Finite generability of some groups of recursive permutations (in Russian) // Problems of Theoretical Cybernetics. Conference Abstracts. — Kazan, 2008. — p. 15.

[34] Volkov, S.A., Generating some classes of recursive functions by superpositions of simple arithmetic functions, Dokl. Math. (2007) 76: 566. doi:10.1134/S1064562407040217

[35] Volkov S. A. An example of a simple quasi-universal function in the class $\mathcal{E}^2$ of the Grzegorczyk hierarchy // Discrete Mathematics and Applications dma. Volume 16, Issue 5, Pages 513526, ISSN (Online) 1569-3929, ISSN (Print) 0924-9265, DOI: 10.1515/156939206779238436, September 2006.

[36] Volkov S. A. An exponential expansion of the Skolem-elementary functions, and bounded superpositions of simple arithmetic functions (in Russian) // Mathematical Problems of Cybernetics. Moscow: Fizmatlit, 2007. — vol. 16. — pp. 163–190.